

Vol. L.

The

No. 177

Church Review

EDITED BY THE
Rev. Henry Mason Brown

OCTOBER, 1887

CONTENTS

1. THE ISSUE IN SOUTH CAROLINA. <i>Rev. Arthur Lowndes</i>	379
2. THE AMERICAN CHURCH BUILDING. <i>Rev. L. Bradford Prince</i>	413
3. THE VOICE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. <i>Rev. Arthur Lowndes</i>	429
4. TRINITIC ETHICS. <i>Prof. J. McNeill Stewart, D. D.</i>	443
5. THE LIFE, TIMES, AND CORRESPONDENCE OF BISHOP WHITE. Chapter VI. The Meeting in New York, October, 1784. <i>At. Rev. William Stevens Perry, D. D., LL. D.</i>	459
6. THE LAW OF THE CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES. Chapter VI. Conflicting Views among the Fathers of the Constitution. <i>Rev. Henry Mason Brown</i>	481
7. CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.	503
<i>Biography, History, Travel, Fiction, Poetry, Educational, Religious, Theology.</i>	

NEW YORK
BAUM AND GEDDES.
Publishers of the Atlantic Monthly, Gardener
LONDON: WILLS GARDNER, DARTON & CO.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, \$4.00 SINGLE NUMBER, 75 CENTS

Church Review

1888.

THE CHURCH REVIEW has long held for many years the first place in the periodical literature of the United States, will begin the new year with new features, and with an increasing interest to the public. Among them will be the **Catholicism of the Church in the United States.**

The **Illustrated** series of monographs will be continued, beginning with the **History of the Abbey.** These historical sketches will be fully illustrated. This series will be followed by another on the **Historical Parishes,** which will also be **Illustrated.**

The **Christian Art** series of articles on **Christian Art**, and will be fully illustrated. This subject has not been treated in all its details by any periodical in the history of Europe. Therefore the articles will be of great interest and value.

The History of the Christian Church.

Dr. Perry, the **Historical** of the **American Church**, will begin in the January number a history of the **American Church** from its foundation to the present time. This bibliography of the **American Church** for the use of those who may care to read what the **American Church** has done, and its practical value to the clergy cannot be overestimated. The need of a continuous history of the **American Church** has been felt by the **American Church** and its **American Church** will be relieved by the **American Church** and which will be the **American Church** of the **American Church**. Dr. Perry will also be an interesting work on the **Life, Times, and Correspondence of Bishop Doane**, which is really the **History of the American Church** for the **last century of the American Church**.

The Law of the Church in the United States.

The **Law of the Church** [1887] of the **Review** by the Editor of the **Review** and author of **The Law of the Church**, **Church Wardens, and Vestrymen**, is a work of great practical value to the clergy. It will be published in the year. The questions of present interest to the **Church** will be discussed by representative men. The fairness of the **Review** is well known for its reputation of being as fair as the **Review** itself. It is the **Review** itself, all schools of thought that may lawfully recognize the **Review** to its pages.

Theory Literature.

The **Theory Literature** in this **Review** is given as much attention to the **Theory Literature** in all its departments as the **Church Review**. The **Theory Literature** is recommended by the weekly and daily press of the

The **Theory Literature** is recommended by the weekly and daily press of the

The **Theory Literature** is recommended by the weekly and daily press of the

BULLETIN OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,

OCTOBER, 1887,

FOR SALE BY

BAUM AND GEDDES,

28 West Twenty-Third Street, New York.

ENGLISH.

- The Broken Vow.** A Story of Here and Hereafter. By Canon Knox-Little.....\$0.75
- The Bee-Man of Orn, and Other Fanciful Tales.** By Frank R. Stockton. 12mo, gilt top..... 1.25
- Underwoods.** By Robert Louis Stevenson..... 1.00
- The Life of Charlotte Brontë.** By Augustine Birrell..... 1.00
- Woman's Voices.** An Anthology of the most characteristic Poems by English, Scotch, and Irish Women..... 1.40
- Victorian Hymns.** English Sacred Songs of Fifty Years..... 4.20
- Ilchester Lectures** on Greco-Slavonic Literature and its Relations to the Folk Lore of Europe during the Middle Ages. By Mr. Gaster..... 3.00
- The Bible and Contemporary History.** An Epitome of a History of the World, from the Creation till the End of the Old Testament. By Rev. W. H. Pin-
nock. 2 vols. 8vo..... 7.20
- Athos; or the Mountain of the Moruks.** By Atherton Riley. Illustrated.
8vo..... 8.00
- Spanish and Italian Folk Songs.** Translated by Alma Strettell. Frontis-
piece. 8vo..... 4.00
- Ivan Ilyitch.** By Count Lyof N. Tolstoi. Translated from the Russian by Nathan
Haskell Dole..... 1.25
- Complete Poetical Works of Robert Browning.** From the author's last
revision. With Portrait, Indexes, etc. Vol. I. Pauline, etc.; Vol. II. Dramatic
Lyrics, etc.; Vol. III. The Ring and the Book; Vol. IV. Christmas Eve and Easter
Day, etc.; Vol. V. Red-Cotton Night-Cap Country, etc.; Vol. VI. The Agamemnon
of Æschylus, etc. In six volumes, crown 8vo, gilt top, each..... 1.75
- The set, half calf, \$18.00; cloth..... 10.00
- Daffodils.** A new volume of Poems. By Mrs. A. D. T. Whitney, author of "Faith
Gartney's Girlhood," "Bonnyborough," etc. Illustrated. Bound in yellow and white,
decorated with golden daffodils. 16mo, gilt top..... 1.25
- History of the Papacy during the Period of the Reformation.**
By Rev. Mandell Creighton. Vols. III. and IV. The Italian Princes, 1464-1518.
With Appendices and Index. 8vo..... 7.50
- N. B. — Vols. I. and II. can still be supplied. They are considerably larger than
Vols. III. and IV., and the price is..... 10.00
- Red Spider.** A Novel. By S. Baring Gold. Paper..... .50
- History and Growth of Church Music.** By Rev. E. L. Taunton..... .50
- Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion.** By Prof. A. H. Sayce. 4.20
- The Church of England: Her Early History, Her Property, and Her Mission.**
By the Rev. E. B. Trotter..... 2.00

Bulletin of New Publications.

Apostolical Succession. A plain Treatise on Holy Orders and Jurisdiction in the Church of England. By H. G. Morse.....\$1.40

An Elementary History of Art. Architecture, Sculpture, Painting, Music. By N. D'Anvers. With a Preface by Prof. Roger Smith. New edition, with over 200 wood engravings. Large crown 8vo (800 pages), cloth, gilt top.....

For students who desire thus to train their own minds, for those who wish to prepare themselves for Continental travel, and, above all, for pupils in schools of a high class, no hand-book of Art History could be more suitable than this volume.

Biographies of the Great Musicians. Specially prepared for Schools, Amateurs, and Students of Music. Including Haydn, Handel, Mozart, Schubert, Schumann, Purcell, Bach, Weber, Mendelssohn, Wagner, Rossini, English Church Composers. Each volume strongly bound in decorated cloth. Price per volume..... 1.00

A History of Music from the Earliest Times to the Present. By W. S. Rockstro, author of "The Life of Handel," "The Life of Mendelssohn," etc. 1 vol. 8vo, cloth..... 6.00

The Printed Book: Its History, Illustration, and Adornment, from Gutenberg to the Present Time. By Henri Bouchot, of the National Library, Paris. Translated and enlarged by Edward C. Bigmore. With 118 illustrations of fac-similes of early typography, printers' marks, copies of book illustrations, and bindings of all ages. Square 12mo, cloth..... 2.50

Into a space equally short it is not easy to crowd more valuable and trustworthy information. Beginning with the Block Books, which anticipated by a few decades the discovery of printing, this work gives a lucid account of the rise of printing, the dispersal over Europe of the German printers, the growth of book illustration, and all similar matter down to the present day. The chief difficulty of the task, the disposition of the immense mass of information that is in existence, is successfully combated. — *Athenæum*.

Letters of Thackeray. 1847-1855. With Portraits and Reproductions of Letters and Drawings. 1 vol. 8vo, gilt top..... 2.50

The publication, in "Scribner's Magazine," of this collection of letters written by the author of "The Newcomes" to his intimate friends, the Brookfields, has attracted more attention in the literary world than any event for many years. For the letters are unique in interest and of the highest importance for the light they throw upon Thackeray's character, bringing the world at large to a more intimate knowledge of the man and increasing the affection in which his memory is held by the readers of his books. Full of wit and humor, quaint or whimsical as the fancy seized the writer, and brightened by numerous inimitable pen-and-ink drawings, these letters, some of which are given in fac-simile, are indeed "a literary treasure."

The Republic of the Future; Or, Socialism a Reality. By Anna Bowman Dodd, author of "Old Cathedral Days," etc. 1 vol. New style of binding..... .50
Cloth..... 1.00

This little book is in the form of a brilliant and highly original series of letters supposed to be written by a Swedish nobleman, on a visit to America in the 21st century. In these letters the writer has depicted what the social, civil, and political aspect of America would be under Socialistic rule, after Socialism had become a fixed and stable form of government.

The Three Tétons. A Story of the Yellowstone. By Alice Wellington Rollins, author of "Story of a Ranch," etc., etc. 1 vol. 16mo, paper..... .50

Martin Luther. His Life and Work. By Peter Bayne, LL. D. 2 vols. 8vo, extra cloth. Price, per set..... 5.00

Dr. Bayne's book has come just at the right time. Luther lives, moves, and speaks in these pages. The reader will not only make acquaintance with the facts of Luther's

Bulletin of New Publications.

life, he will follow the events of his career with the interest and vivid realizations of the spectator of a powerful drama, and will feel that he sees Luther and knows the man as he lived and worked.

- The Ancient Cities of the New World:** Being Voyages and Explorations in Mexico and Central America, from 1857 to 1882. By Désiré Charnay. Translated from the French by J. Gonino and Helen S. Conant. Introduction by Allen Thorndike Rice. 209 Illustrations and a Map. Large 8vo, ornamental cloth.....\$6.00
- Bar Harbor Days.** A Tale of Mount Desert. By Mrs. Burton Harrison. Illustrated. 16mo, ornamental cloth..... 1.25
- Their Pilgrimage.** By Charles Dudley Warner. Richly Illustrated by C. S. Reinhart. Post 8vo, ornamental cloth..... 2.00
- Sebastopol.** By Count Leo Tolstoi. Translated by F. D. Millet. With Introduction by W. D. Howells. With Portrait. 16mo, cloth..... .75
- The Russian Church and Russian Dissent.** By Albert F. Heard. Crown 8vo, cloth..... 1.75
- The Wonder Clock; Or, Four-and-Twenty Marvelous Tales:** being one for each hour of the day. Written and Illustrated with 160 drawings by Howard Pyle, author of "Pepper and Salt," "The Rose of Paradise," etc. Embellished with verses by Katharine Pyle. 4to, ornamental cloth..... 3.00
- Horsemanship for Women.** By Theodore H. Mead. With 41 Illustrations by Gray Parker. Post 8vo, cloth..... 1.25
How to buy a horse, how to train him, how to ride him. This book should be read by all who are interested in horsemanship.
- The Law of Divorce.** A Treatise on the Law of Divorce, with the Causes for which Divorces will be granted in all the States and Territories; the Time of Residence required in each; and a brief Digest of the leading Decisions by the Appellate Courts. Containing also a careful Compilation of the Latest Divorce Statistics. By A. Parlett Lloyd, of the Baltimore Bar. 8vo..... 2.00
Sheep..... 2.50
- Henry Clay.** By Carl Schurz. In American Statesmen Series. 2 vols. 16mo, gilt top..... 2.50
Half morocco..... 5.00
- Colonial Ballads, Sonnets, and Other Verses.** By Margaret J. Preston. 16mo, gilt top..... 1.25
- American Men of Letters.** Brief biographies of distinguished American authors. Edited by Charles Dudley Warner.
- BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.** By James Bach McMaster, author of "A History of the People of the United States." With a Steel Portrait. 1 vol. 16mo, gilt top..... 1.25
Half morocco..... 2.50
- Franklin is generally thought of as a sagacious statesman, an accomplished diplomat, a philosopher, an inventor, but not as a man of letters. Yet he was one of the most prolific and most effective writers of his time, and if his fame as a philosopher and statesman had been less, his autobiography and essays on political, historical, philosophical, and moral subjects would have gained for him the literary renown to which they justly entitle him. Professor McMaster, whose history of the people of the United States has made him famous, portrays Franklin's qualities and achievements as a man of letters; and his book cannot fail to be one of the most engaging of the series to which it belongs.

Bulletin of New Publications.

NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE. By James Russell Lowell. With a fine Steel Portrait. 1 vol. 16mo, gilt top.....	\$1.25
Half morocco.....	2.50

The personal and literary career of Hawthorne, described by Mr. Lowell, cannot fail to possess a remarkable value and interest. The rank of Hawthorne as one of the greatest writers in American literature is generally conceded, but the character of his genius is so unique that it requires for its adequate portrayal far more than ordinary critical judgment. In Mr. Lowell's hands it will be treated with a comprehensiveness and sympathetic appreciation which will do it full justice; and the book will be not merely a satisfactory account of Hawthorne's life and writings, but is also certain to be a wise and charming discussion of some of the most important features and products of American literature.

The following volumes have already appeared in this series :—

WASHINGTON IRVING. By Charles Dudley Warner.	
NOAH WEBSTER. By Horace E. Scudder.	
HENRY D. THOREAU. By Frank B. Sanborn.	
GEORGE RIPLEY. By O. B. Frothingham.	
J. FENIMORE COOPER. By T. R. Lounsbury.	
MARGARET FULLER OSSOLI. By T. W. Higginson.	
RALPH WALDO EMERSON. By Oliver Wendell Holmes.	
EDGAR ALLAN POE. By George E. Woodberry.	
NATHANIEL P. WILLIS. By Henry A. Beers.	

Each volume, with fine Steel Portrait, 16mo, cloth, gilt top.....	1.25
Half morocco.....	2.50

(Other volumes in preparation.)

REPRINTS FROM THE CHURCH REVIEW.

Communion Wine. A Critical Examination of Scripture Words and Historic Testimony. By the Rev. Edward H. Jewitt, S. T. D. 64 pp. paper.....	.25
The American Church and Its Name. By the Hon. L. Bradford Prince..	.25
The Name of the Church. By the Hon. Hugh W. Sheffey. Paper.....	.25

Judge Prince argues in favor of a change of name in the corporate title of the Church in the United States, and Judge Sheffey against it. The interest taken in the articles by the distinguished representatives of the Church has been so great that a reprint of them from the Review has been necessary.

The Issue in South Carolina. By the Rev. John Kershaw. Paper.....	.25
--	-----

A review of the troubles growing out of the attempt to exclude the colored clergy from the Convention of the Diocese of South Carolina.

Any of the above publications will be sent, post-paid, on receipt of price by

BAUM AND GEDDES,

28 West Twenty-Third Street, New York.

THE CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. L.—OCTOBER, 1887.—No. CLXXVII.

THE ISSUE IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

Statement of the Causes which led to the Withdrawal of the Deputies from the late Diocesan Convention of South Carolina.

Prepared by the Committee appointed for that Purpose.
Charleston, S. C. : Walker, Evans & Cogswell.

THE statement of the causes which led to the withdrawal of certain delegates from the late Diocesan Convention, as prepared by the Committee appointed for that purpose, has appeared.

In most particulars it is calm, if not dispassionate, though it be neither brief nor fair to those who differ from the writers on the points discussed, in the opinion of some at least of those who so differ.

It is needless perhaps to add that every one of the Committee is a lawyer, most of them eminent, all of them used to the kind of work necessary to make a statement of this sort the best and strongest and most convincing that the nature of the case allowed. But let not this fact suffice to make us decide that its statements and conclusions are necessarily *right*, for who that is at all familiar with legal decisions and reports of cases decided does not also know (to adapt Bassanio's words, true as they are of "religion" as understood by some), that —

In law

What damned error, but some learned brow
Will plead it, and approve it with cases cited,
Hiding the grossness with fair ornament ?

A congenial task awaited them here. Constitutional and Canonical law and its interpretation wooed them to draw their

pens and make "the worse appear the better reason." It is fair to assume that in this direction they have done their best. It is fair also to state that this is written from the standpoint of almost entire dissent from the views and positions taken and expressed by the seceders.

Let us take up *seriatim* the points made and see what true, candid, and fair answer may be given.

1. On page 4 of the pamphlet it is said, after referring to the bi-centennial celebration in 1875 of the Church of England's planting in South Carolina, "for an innovation of at least doubtful expediency in the Church, . . . Bishop and Clergy were willing to see the lay representatives of two thirds of her laymen leave her Convention."

This is begging the question. It is assertion without proof; but it makes a neat point of departure. It throws the ungracious conduct of Bishop and Clergy into dark and unenviable relief, against the bright and beautiful background of the laity's service and love, their sorrow and distress in being compelled, as they think, to leave the Convention. It would never do to allow it to be thought for a moment that Bishop and Clergy had ever loved or served the Church, or that they felt any sorrow or distress in seeing the laymen leave. Yet such a thing is within the bounds of possibility. Indeed, many deem it a fact. As to the "innovation," it will be quite time to discuss that, when it shall be shown to have even the semblance of fact in it.

2. A history is next given of what transpired in reference to the application of S. Mark's Church (colored) for admission into union with the Convention, in 1875. We are told that the Rev. Mr. Prentiss in his resolution "went so far as broadly to assert that the Convention possesses and will exercise the right of excluding from this body all such delegates of the class herein referred to (colored delegates), as it shall hereafter regard likely to interrupt the peace of the Church or impede the glory of God."

Now that this was a very bold and extraordinary declaration, that *any* clergyman who would venture to "go so far as broadly to assert" such a fact was doing an almost unparalleled act of daring intrepidity, cannot be admitted when it is considered that the Constitution and Canons of the Diocese declare this right (of exclusion as also of admission) to exist; declare, too, that it belongs to the Convention, and when the Convention

actually exercised that right next year in declining to admit the delegates from S. Mark's.

S. Mark's has never applied again. The question, therefore, of admitting colored delegates to the Convention has never since been up for discussion. Let the readers of this bear this fact in mind. *Never*, but once, in all our history, has the question of admitting colored delegates to Convention been before the Diocese. The right of a colored clergyman, possessing every qualification imposed by the Constitution and canons of the Church, to a seat and vote, either or both, in the Convention, is an entirely separate and distinct matter. The minute we lose sight of this fact, we grow confused in our reasoning on this subject. The attempt is made on page 7 of the pamphlet under discussion to confound the two, where it is said, "the question (of admitting S. Mark's and its delegates) was, however, in a measure, revived in 1880, by the application of Thaddaeus Saltus, a colored person, for admission to the order of Deacons." The words in parentheses truly declare the sole question which was before the Convention of 1876.

The question of admitting Saltus to Holy Orders was a very different one. It never came before Convention, but before the Standing Committee. It was not a question of admitting any person or congregation of persons into union with the Convention, but of admitting a colored man to Holy Orders. The two questions are as utterly distinct as the question of admitting a new county into the State, its representatives into the legislature, is from the question of admitting a colored cadet (who in due time, and being found qualified, would become a lieutenant in the army of the United States) into West Point Academy. Is it possible that any man can be found so incapable of discrimination as to fail to see the distinction here made? It is sincerely to be hoped that at least no man who undertakes to discuss *this* question is so incapable.

3. The writers of the pamphlet go back forty years in time, and to New York, to find a guide for us and our present duty in relation to what? Why, to the admission of colored delegates to Convention. Is that the question now before the Diocese? It was eleven years ago, but has never been since. Why, then, should it be sought to be made appear that this is the question? Is this really the candor, the frankness and straightforwardness, that may rightly be expected of brethren

dealing with brethren of the same Church and communion? Is it really the act of those who argue not for the triumph of their *side*, but of the *truth*? But let it pass—it is not desired herein to impugn any man's motives.

When Saltus applied to the Standing Committee, Messrs. E. McCrady, Sr., C. G. Memminger, and the Rev. W. H. Campbell were members of it. After passing the resolutions given on page 8 of the pamphlet, the whole Committee signed Saltus's papers, recommending him for Deacon's Orders. These same gentlemen were on the Committee that recommended Saltus for Priest's Orders.

Saltus was present at the Conventions of 1881 and 1882. In 1881 he was entitled to and occupied a seat, but at that time had no vote. In 1882 he was entitled to a seat and a vote, and he enjoyed both those "privileges of the Convention." No one made objection at the time, so far as the record shows. Why was not the point that was made in 1885 made in 1881 and 1882, and 1883 and 1884, when Saltus was as fully entitled to and enjoyed the privileges of Convention, or if he was absent, was so from choice, and not because any one had questioned his right? Was it not, then, a just cause of surprise that when in 1885, Saltus's successor, Bishop, came to Convention a vigorous and determined effort was for the first time made to declare and act upon the principle that none other than white clergymen were entitled to any of the privileges of the Convention? There was no question here in relation to "delegates," because clergymen are not "delegates" to the Convention. Nobody sends them there. No congregation delegates them to act as its representative. They are not deputed to act by or on behalf of the people to whom they minister. How, then, and in what possible sense, are they "delegates"? They simply are *not* delegates—they go to Convention under the provisions of the Constitution and Canons of the Diocese; they represent no constituency—they are present because the laws of the Convention give them the right and privilege of being there.

There is *one* Church in the Diocese whose minister is a "delegate" to the Convention. There may be *more* than one, but there certainly is *one*, viz., S. Philip's Church, Charleston. By-law XI. of that church provides that its minister or ministers, together with the four lay-delegates to be elected on every Easter Monday, shall act as "delegates to the Diocesan Con-

vention." It further provides that no minister or ministers of the Church shall be competent to represent the same, save in connection with two or more of its lay-delegates; that the minister or ministers shall not have the right in Convention to vote on matters involving the temporal affairs of the Church (though the lay-delegates may of course vote on matters involving the spiritual affairs thereof).

Here we have the S. Philip's idea of the rights and privileges of the Clergy, to wit, that they are entirely subordinate to those of the laity, and are conferred as a free (!) and gracious gift by the laity!

This is bad enough, but if one would see the S. Philip's idea and conception of its rights, and the honor due to itself, one must read and reflect upon the succeeding clause of this precious by-law. But here it is: "But no *rule*, article, or canon adopted by the Convention shall be binding on this congregation, until the same shall have been read and considered at one meeting of the church, and considered, debated, and confirmed at another."

S. Philip's congregation is therefore above the Convention—the Convention is, as it were, the part that is wagged, and S. Philip's is the part that does the wagging; the minister or ministers thereof constitute a very inferior sort of side-show to the great circus adjoining. No wonder that gentlemen reared with such lofty ideas of ministerial rights and privileges should be ready to deny the existence of any clerical rights except such as may be delegated to them by the congregation that does them the inestimable honor of allowing them to preach, baptise, and administer Holy Communion to them. Congregationalism run mad could scarcely devise anything more entirely opposed to the principles upon which the Church is based, than S. Philip's has devised in this wondrous by-law. It is the doctrine of "nullification" applied to Ecclesiastical relations.

4. On page 9 of the pamphlet great stress is laid on the resolutions passed by the Standing Committee at the time the Saltus case was before them. Yet, after passing them, the Committee unanimously passed Saltus's papers. It seems manifest, that if what those resolutions stated as to the condition of the colored race and their relations to us was *true*, no colored man, however "exceptional" his case might have been, should have been allowed to pass the Committee as a Candidate

for Orders. If in their judgment it violated "Nature herself" to place a colored man in the position of teacher and ruler of the white race, then no circumstances, however exceptional, should have made them consent to the ordination of a colored man. But the case of Saltus is not the only one. There is also the case of Quarles. The Rev. W. H. Campbell and Messrs. E. McCrady, Sr., and C. G. Memminger were on the Standing Committee that recommended Quarles as a Candidate for Holy Orders. [See *Journal*, 1885.] In other words, these gentlemen were influential members of the Standing Committee at the time when *the only two* colored men who have applied for Orders in this Diocese made their successful application to that Committee and received their recommendation.

If it be the first step that costs, those who aided Saltus and Quarles to take that step are more responsible and more blameworthy (from the present standpoint of those gentlemen) than any other persons who might be said to have aided them in taking any subsequent steps. They cannot by seceding clear themselves of this responsibility. If they had united in opposing the admission of Saltus and Quarles as Candidates for Orders, when their papers came before the Committee, as strenuously and determinedly as they have opposed the coming of colored clergymen into Convention, it is exceedingly unlikely that either Saltus or Quarles would ever have become "admitted candidates" from this Diocese. If their present position on this whole matter is correct, it was their duty to oppose the incoming of any colored man into the ministry of the Church. That they were admitted, without protest from these three strenuous opponents, so far as any evidence shows, is not the least strange paradox in the matter of their action on this subject.

5. The pamphlet next gives a history of the Sewanee Conference and its results. It does not give the fact that, in 1884, after a report on the subject made by the Bishop and Standing Committee to the Convention, a Committee was appointed to take the matter in hand and report as early as practicable to the Convention. This Committee, whose chairman was the Rev. Dr. A. Toomer Porter, made their report the next day, affirming their belief that the Sewanee Conference best expressed the views of the Church at the South as to our duty toward the colored race, and outlined the best methods of discharging the same. They went on to recommend a special

missionary organisation for them, and devised the machinery for that end, recommending also such changes in the Constitution as would exclude the colored deacons provided for in the report from the Diocesan Convention.

This report and the resolutions appended were *unanimously* adopted by the Convention. Surely it is not true that the Rev. Dr. Porter recommended a separate missionary organisation for the colored people! But it is.

Surely the Convention did not adopt the report of a Committee of which that gentleman was chairman! But it *did*, and *unanimously*.

But see what use the pamphlet makes of the recommendations of the Sewanee Conference. Claiming it to be a clerical conference, though one fourth were laymen, they ask if laymen are to be blamed for having the same opinion still, and for still objecting to "*these people*" being *forced* into *their* Conventions in 1887, when the clergy thought in 1883 that they should be in a separate organisation?

A great many things are implied here.

(1.) That the clergy seem to have changed their minds in the interim.

(2.) That the laymen are holding the same views that they have ever held.

(3.) That some body or bodies (not specified) is, or are, trying to *force* "*these people*" into their (the laymen's) Conventions in 1887.

It is difficult to argue with those who make so many different issues in so many different parts of their statement. The sinuosity of the pamphlet is equal to that of the Gulf Stream or the isothermal belt. But to the first charge, it may be replied, that there is no evidence whatever of a change of mind on the part of the clergy, from 1883 to 1887. Also, that if they have changed their minds, it is only *what is allowable*; but there is no proof that they *have, and they have not*.

To the second charge, let the fact that Saltus sat unchallenged in two Conventions, and exercised his rights and enjoyed his privileges, be the sufficient answer.

To the third charge, it is enough to say that nobody is trying to *force* colored people into Conventions, though it *is* news that the Conventions are the property of *laymen* exclusively. That *seems* to be their claim, but it is *not* the *law*, nor the *fact*.

Clergymen have quite as much right there as laymen have. Laymen, as an order, had no rights there, up to and until one hundred and three years ago, when the General Convention of this Church *gave* them the right. How many know that, as Bishop White avers, in *no* branch of the Church Catholic, up to that time [1784], had it ever been proposed that laymen should sit as an order in the legislative councils of the Church? And yet, in a little more than a hundred years from the time they were admitted to a share in Church legislation, they make a serious and determined effort to deprive of their rights those who, according to the universal and unbroken testimony of Church history, have always been entitled to voices and votes in Church Councils. Comment is unnecessary. The bare facts are sufficient to show what immense strides towards absolutism as to their power in Church Councils have been made by laymen, whose title to seats and votes in them, in point of time, as compared with the rights of the clergy, is as one hundred years to eighteen hundred!

6. On page 25 of the pamphlet it is said, "We venture to assert that no instance in the history of the Church can be found in which clergymen have had seats in any legislative synod or council of the Church by virtue simply of their orders." What is meant by "*legislative* synod or council" is not clear, nor is it defined anywhere by the writers of the pamphlet; but to go no farther back than the South Carolina Diocesan Constitution of 1807, as it is published in Dalcho, pp. 602, *et seq.*, Rule 3 says: "The Minister or Ministers of every Church who shall accede to these rules shall always be, *ex officio*, a member or members of the Convention."

True, the rule goes on to restrict their right to vote under certain circumstances, but that is not the point. The point is as to the clergyman's right to be *ex officio* a member of the Diocesan Council. That right is here recognised, and continued to be for *many* years. Judge Hoffman, who is as good authority on ecclesiastical law as any or all the writers of the pamphlet under consideration, says in his work [*Law of the Church*, p. 187], "The principle of the early Church" was "that its *ministers as such* form part of the synodal council."

No record of any council ever held can be adduced in which the clergy were not present, in and by virtue of their Order. The proof to the contrary is challenged. Assertion is not proof.

The right to participation in Church legislative synods was never conferred on the Presbyters of the Christian Church in any age, simply because it was an *original* and inherent right.

But this is not the question before the Church now. Some individual clergymen have claimed that they sat in Convention by virtue of their Order only. While much may be said in support of such a view, few, if any, of our clergy claim this. What they *do* claim is, that under the Constitution and Canons of the Diocese they have a right, as clergymen, possessing the qualifications there imposed, to the privileges of the Convention. This is *all* that the clergy claim. With one or two exceptions, they have never claimed anything more. It is an unworthy attempt to excite prejudice against them, to insinuate that they are claiming their seats and votes in Convention by the almost "Divine right" of their official positions.

Presumably, from the language used, the right to sit and vote in Convention is a *privilege*—"a sop to Cerberus"—bestowed by a set of men who, until one hundred and three years ago, had never sat or voted as an order in Church councils, upon another set of men who had always enjoyed that "privilege."

7. Reference is next made to sections iii and iv of Canon 8, as to the organisation of the Convention. It is admitted that if a quorum be found present, the canon directs the President to declare the Convention, then and there, "*duly organised*."

The pamphlet goes on to say that it must not be supposed that this organisation is all that is necessary before proceeding to business, but that two committees must now be appointed: one for the clergy, and another for the lay deputies, etc. Now, as a matter of fact, no allusion whatever is again made in the canons to the organisation of the Convention. These words, "*duly organised*," contain the only reference to the subject, and in many instances where the Committees on Credentials have made their report, no action was taken on them. Their main business as recognised by the Convention, year after year, is to see that those on the lists are rightly there, according to the provisions and qualifications of the Constitution and Canons, and to supply omissions, if any there be.

Cushing is quoted to show that in all deliberative assemblies, the members of which are chosen or appointed to represent others, an investigation must be had before proceeding to business, to determine who are duly elected and returned as mem-

bers. Mark the italics! They explain the whole difficulty. Cushing speaks of bodies to which persons are elected and returned—not of bodies like the Convention, where only some of the members are elected and returned. He clearly refers to assemblies that have no elements of permanence in them. In the Convention, the Bishop as President, the Secretary, and the Clergy of the Diocese, whoever they may be at the time, are the standing or permanent factors. Only the lay-delegates are elected and returned. The clergy represent no constituency—they are not chosen to represent others. Cushing's rule, therefore, does not apply to them, nor can it fairly be made to apply. This is too clear to be discussed. Cushing had no reference to an assembly like our Convention. But if this is not enough, let us refer to the Convention Journals and see what the practice has been—how the Convention has construed the meaning of its own Constitution and Canons for many years, first premising that the present Constitution, whether adopted or amended matters not, is the Constitution as it stood in 1876. These Committees on Credentials were appointed after the Convention had been declared "duly organised," and went out to make up their reports. They returned and made them. Never once, from 1876 to 1885, *ten years*, were the reports so made received and acted upon! Yet the Memminger Committee say on page 16 of their pamphlet, "Until the report is received and acted upon, the Convention cannot proceed to business." In fact, it did proceed to business for ten years without receiving and acting on them. That is the Convention's answer to this flimsy pretext.

Feeling this difficulty, the writers labor hard to substantiate their indefensible position. They refer to and admit the fact that this has been the practice for years past, and quote Lord Kenyon's indignant remonstrance against the doctrine that a "commoner makes right" *WHAT IS WRONG IN ITSELF*. No wonder the learned judge did so. He would probably be more indignant if he were sitting in a case where a position like this is taken, while the fact is never once mentioned that *ever since* the changes were made in the organic law of the Convention the practice has been invariably the same, viz.: not to act upon the reports of the Committees on Credentials. More than that, such want of action or negative action has prevailed entirely in consequence of the changes alluded to. Such a practice never

prevailed before that time. No other practice has prevailed since. Is it not perfectly plain that the difference in practice was the result of the changes in the organic law of the body where it prevailed? The practice under the old canon is not the point,—the only point is, what has been the practice, unvarying and unvaried, under the new canon, and that we have shown to be entirely against the arguments and statements of the pamphlet. What caused the attempt to change the practice as it prevailed under the new canon? Without a doubt it was the coming in of Bishop and Harper into the Convention of 1885. That, and nothing else. This interpretation would never have been heard of, much less insisted on, if colored men had not come into the Convention. It never was heard of before, not even when Mr. Saltus, the Great Exceptional, sat and voted in Convention. Since 1885 very little if anything else has had a chance to be heard. To say, as on page 22, "This question . . . would have been insisted on by us just as earnestly had it been raised on any other occasion," is one of those extraordinary statements to which the only reply that can be made is, *Credat Fudæ Appella, non Ego*. But Bishop and Harper came to the Convention of 1885 and furnished the occasion on which the question was raised. The Memminger Committee contend that they are borne out in their construction of the canon in that it provides that the list of clergy furnished by the Bishop shall be only presumptive evidence of their rights. Granted. They further say that the canon provides that if question be made as to the right of any one clergyman to a seat or vote in Convention, such question must be determined by the Convention (not the Committee) itself, "according to the provisions of the Constitution." Granted so far. They go on, "to wit: by a vote by Orders." Denied. Unless the "provisions of the Constitution" is an expression purposely misleading, it means the qualifications imposed by itself. If a clergyman's right be questioned, reference is had to the Constitution to determine that right. How else can it possibly be determined except by referring to the Constitution and ascertaining whether, under the terms, provisions, and qualifications of that instrument, such clergyman has a right in Convention or not? The canon simply takes it out of the Committee's hands and puts it into the hands of the whole Convention and says, "The Convention must decide whether, under the Constitution, this

clergyman has a right to come in." It has no reference to the vote by Orders at all. The clergy list in its entirety cannot be questioned. Any clergyman on that list may have questioned his right to a seat or vote in Convention. But the specific point of objection, the precise point of failure, the exact spot of weakness in his claim, must be clearly stated. The issue must be squarely and fairly joined. "Mr. A.'s right to a vote in this body is questioned in that he, 1. Has not resided in the Diocese twelve months; or, 2. Has not for the same period been performing his duty as Rector, or Missionary, or Professor; or, 3. Has not presented his annual report to the ecclesiastical authority." Mr. A. affirms that he has done all these necessary things. The issue is joined, and the Convention decides the question. Evidently this is what the language of the canon means, and has no reference to the vote by Orders. But suppose the vote by Orders to be meant (which it distinctly is not), and that a resolution comes up to the effect that the "name of the Rev. J. H. M. Pollard be stricken out of the clergy list, as was the case in 1887. Immediately the mind inquires, "Why? Wherein is he disqualified? What has he done or failed to do that his name should be stricken off from the roll of the clergy in the Diocese?" The only, the single true answer is that he must go because he is a colored man. Not a word about color in the qualifications, yet because he is colored he must go. The Bishop's list must be amended by making it conform not to what is true, but to what is false. The Convention will make it say that Mr. Pollard is not a clergyman of this Diocese, whereas in fact he is. The Constitution in its present form dates from 1876. Under it a colored man has sat in two Conventions, viz.: 1881 and 1882. His name appeared on the clergy list during those two and the two succeeding years. Why was not his name stricken out? Was Mr. Pollard not as fully entitled to everything in Convention as Mr. Saltus? If, then, Mr. Saltus's name had a right on that list, Mr. Pollard's had, and it could not be stricken out without making the list a false list. It was a true list as furnished by the Bishop, called by the Secretary, scrutinised and reported upon by the Committee, and to strike out from it any name would have falsified it. No reason why it should be stricken out was given, — none appears to-day upon the face of the proceedings as given in the *Journal*, — and therefore to consent to strike out a man's name

from the clergy list for no cause assigned, is as much as to consent to place every clergyman's status in Convention in jeopardy. The clergy could not consent to it, and they never will, until they are ready to yield up the last vestige of their independence, and have lost the last atom of their manhood.

But let this also pass. Suppose that on such a resolution a vote was taken by Orders, and that the clergy vote one way and the laity another, is there a decision? There is not. The Constitution declares positively that "a majority in both Orders shall be necessary to a decision." Where there is *no* majority in both Orders, there is no decision. That our Bishop should have been led to believe, by a supposed parliamentarian, that in case the Convention divided in this way his ruling would not stand, is not surprising; that he followed this method several times is also not surprising; that once he saw the clear and undoubted meaning of the Constitution, that it would require a majority in both Orders to *upset* his ruling, and adopted that method, and held on to it with a dignity, a calmness, and a courage that was admirable, is also not surprising to those who know him. The fact was that he had been badgered for three years; that he took advice from parliamentarians as to how he should put such a question; he did everything he could to refrain from showing or exercising "episcopal prerogative," and only when he saw such a determination on the part of certain delegates to "rule or ruin," he at last, most reluctantly, and only when driven to the wall, took a position in which he has been justified in the eyes of the whole Church except a very small segment in South Carolina.

8. But to proceed. If on pages 23, 24, 25, the Memminger Committee mean that the Convention has the right to pass upon the "qualifications" of its members, as those are enumerated in the Constitution, there is no disputing that point. In fact it never has been disputed or denied in our Convention. What has been both disputed and denied is that laymen have a right to declare that a clergyman, resident in the Diocese, and in charge of a parish, shall not have his constitutional rights in Convention, and that his name shall be stricken from the list of clergy. The laity seem to find it difficult to see this point. They seem not able to understand that that is why the clergy oppose them. It is because the clergy think that a man who is covered by the shield of our Diocesan Constitution must not

be dragged out from that protection and expelled by means that are clearly and broadly unconstitutional, *extra-constitutional*, and what Dr. Jarvis or Dr. Anybody-else has said in the heat of debate is not to the point. What Judge Hoffman has said is taken as sound law, and no one objects to his position, but agrees to it and accepts it as right and just. The right of laymen to eject clergymen from Convention who possess every constitutional qualification, — this is denied. It amounts to this, that these gentlemen would eject a man not because he does not possess all the qualifications they have seen fit to make, but because he does not possess all that they have seen fit not to make. For some clergymen to retain their places in Convention, it is necessary, in their judgment, that the said clergymen should not only have all the constitutional qualifications imposed, but others besides, and because the clergy cannot agree to that, they are exhibiting a degree of priestly *hauteur*, and claiming a degree of priestly prerogative that cannot be put up with in South Carolina at least.

On page 26 of the pamphlet it is said that "the clergy insisted on making the admission (of colored clergymen) a condition of the organisation of the Convention." This, according to the views of the writers, is correctly stated. Let us place by its side the clergy's view of the situation. They believed that, according to the canon, the Convention was *already* "duly organised," and they could see no reason for any further organising. Nothing that has been said in the pamphlet has had the effect to induce them to think they were wrong in that opinion. The practice of the Convention for ten years in going on with its business, immediately after the Convention had been declared "duly organised" and before the Committees on Credentials had reported, confirmed them in this view. Nothing that has since transpired has sufficed to upset this conclusion.

9. A history, fairly impartial, follows in the pamphlet, of the Convention of 1887. On the appeal from the Bishop's ruling that the Convention was duly organised for business, the question was put, "Shall the decision of the chair stand as the decision of the House?" The result was a non-concurrence of Orders. The chair thereupon announced that his decision had not been sustained, which was a mistake. A non-concurrence of Orders can never make a decision. Only a majority vote in both Orders can do that. Wrong in this, however, the Bishop

was right on the main point. The Convention, according to these gentlemen, was not organised. No one there, except the Bishop, perhaps, had been found by the Convention to be entitled either to a seat or a vote, because the report of neither Committee on Credentials had then been received and acted upon. Hence, according to their reasoning, the persons there present did not constitute a *Convention*, they were only a mob, perhaps an *embryonic* Convention, but nothing more. The Bishop declined to accede to a proposition so manifestly absurd. He refused to keep up this farce. Three days had already been consumed, and the business of the Diocese was clamoring for attention. He therefore rightly declined to consider any further appeals as to organisation, and directed the secretary to go on with the reading of the Rules of Order. At this juncture a delegate from S. Philip's Church arose and excitedly said, "Mr. President, if you go on with this thing, you will break up the Convention. The right of appeal is inalienable," etc. Another layman then sent up to the chair the paper announcing the withdrawal of the delegates from S. Paul. The Bishop told the secretary to go on with the reading of the Rules. Then followed the withdrawal of most of the representatives of twenty other parishes. These all stood in the church behind the cross-aisle, which formed the bar of the Convention, until it was found that a quorum of both Orders was left in Convention, when they withdrew. The threat that the Bishop's course would break up the Convention had not come true! The gentleman who uttered it was *quo ad hoc*, a false prophet! The Convention went on with its business!

On the next day, a unanimous resolution was conveyed to the seceders assembled in the Sunday-school room of S. Philips Church, to the effect that the Convention profoundly regretted the withdrawal of the delegates, and affectionately and most earnestly requested them to return and resume their places in Convention. The Committee appointed to convey this resolution did so, and in addition stated that their understanding of the matter was, that if they, the seceders, saw fit, they were free to return and begin where they left off; that if they came, they would do so unhampered by any conditions whatever. They were informed also of certain business done by the Convention since their withdrawal, as stated on page 28 of the pamphlet (except that, according to the *Journal*, the Standing Committee was not elected until *after* this interview).

The next step was their communication as given on page 28, which was laid before the Convention. At a glance it will be seen that the seceders asked that those who remained in convention should surrender unconditionally, and that the Bishop should stultify himself by doing what he had declined to do the evening before. We felt obliged kindly and respectfully to say we regretted we were unable to accede to the terms proposed. The door to further overtures was left wide open, but they made no attempt to enter it. They had evidently made up their minds. Whether there was or was not any course left open except to withdraw was a question for them to decide, and they made their choice, and this pamphlet constitutes their defence, such as it is. They say they had but four alternative courses to choose from. First, "to submit"—to what? They say, to abandon all right of the laity to an opinion upon the organisation of the Convention, and to recognise the action of those sustaining the Bishop. It was impressed upon those of us who attended the last three Conventions that the laity not only had opinions on that subject, but that they expressed them with great freedom and force. Not alone expressed them thus, but assuming their ability to break up the Convention, when they found the Bishop standing firm, they made the effort, and it failed. *Hinc illæ lachrymæ.* Had they succeeded, there would have been none of this long apology for their course. No *right* of the laity was jeopardised. A claim made by them, without foundation in law or reason, was rejected; but that does not constitute a *right*. Did Mr. Haskell conceive that he was abandoning the rights of the laity when he declined to make any more dilatory motions? Did he not speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, when, after the first vote, he said the matter in issue had come to a vote, and had been decided against him, and that he would submit to that decision? That was all there was in it, in his opinion, and he manfully took his defeat and remained in the Convention. Other laymen, well thought of in point of character and intelligence, took the same view and remained. Are they, too, to be regarded as having abandoned the rights of their order, as traitors to their trust?

Their second alternative was to protest and remain. They say they tried that two years ago, but without results. What results they had expected it to produce, they do not say. It is useless, therefore, to try to ascertain; but, at any rate, they did not adopt this course.

Their third alternative was to "filibuster." This, they say, would have given rise to unseemly conduct and struggle. This is simply delicious in its *naïveté*. Out of the twelve days spent in the last three Conventions, nearly *nine* of them were occupied by "the parliamentary struggle we had made." "*Given rise to unseemly conduct and struggle*" indeed! The last three Conventions were memorable for nothing else. And, pray who has made the struggle? Which, the clergy or the laity, have been the aggressors, every time? The simple statement of the fact that nine days out of twelve were spent in making a parliamentary struggle is quite sufficient to justify the term "filibustering," whether applied by opponents or friends. The truth never requires justification; and this is truth.

Their fourth alternative was to withdraw, they say, and refuse to recognise any action taken by those who remained. This was, they allege, the only course they saw consistent with their dignity and the rights of the laity. Only so could they resist the *intrusion* of the colored race into our Councils. But they took good care to get outside of the Council first; how could they *resist* the intrusion from *that* standpoint? And what about Mr. Saltus? Why was not some of this awful din raised about him? In what respects does Mr. Pollard's case differ from his, except that Mr. Pollard has sat and voted in a good many Conventions in old Virginia? Why should South Carolinians fear to follow the example of that great commonwealth, whether in affairs of Church or State? It would seem that if Mr. Pollard was good enough to sit in a Virginia Convention, he was good enough to sit here. It would also seem that if, under the terms of the Virginia Diocesan Constitution, from which ours differs in no essential particular in respect of the qualifications imposed upon clerical members of its Convention, Mr. Pollard was *entitled* to a seat *there*, he was equally *entitled* to a seat *here*. Colored clergymen were not contemplated by the original Diocesan Constitution of Virginia any more than by ours, and yet the view presented here did not prevail there. Why should it prevail here? To ask us to go back eighty or a hundred years, to find out what the Constitution then meant, is to ask that we should forget that the Constitution as we now have it was revised and amended in 1873-75, in full view of all the great events that have happened in the last thirty years, and when it was known that in other Dioceses colored clergymen had been ordained, and

when it might have been easily anticipated — and should have been — that in course of time one or more of them would find their way to South Carolina. Not only so, but when colored men in our own Diocese applied to our own Standing Committee to be admitted as candidates for Holy Orders, they were admitted, and one of them sat and voted in Convention, and not one word was heard about the meaning of the word “clergyman” in the Constitution, or of the necessity of going back eighty years to discover its meaning.

10. We are told on page 32 of the pamphlet that “this is the first attempt to make a Church other than the Church of a race; that ever since Paul and Barnabas parted asunder on a race question, we find the Church everywhere a race Church; that the three great divisions of the Church to-day are the Latin, the Greek, and the Anglo-Saxon.” Now this *is* news, especially that about Paul and Barnabas parting asunder on a race question. The record says they quarrelled about S. Mark, who had deserted the work on their previous journey, and S. Paul did not think he was the right kind of a man to take again. Barnabas, being his kinsman, stuck by him. A race question! Surely no pun is intended here — they cannot be referring to the rapidity with which the Evangelist covered the distance between Pamphylia and home? These are new developments in ethnology, certainly. Has there *ever* been a Christian Church founded on *race* lines? If so, where, when, by whom?

11. The pamphlet next furnishes a “singular illustration of this” (presumably that the Church is a race Church) in the case of a colored person who applied to become a candidate for Orders in New York in 1819, twenty years after the Act for the gradual emancipation of slaves had passed. The Standing Committee passed him, but with the understanding that he was not to have a seat in Convention, nor should his congregation be represented therein. From this state of facts the overwhelming and triumphant conclusion is drawn that neither Bishop Hobart nor his Standing Committee “imagined that emancipation had given the *colored race* a constitutional right to a seat in Convention.” It will, perhaps, be sufficient to reply that no such claim has ever been set up in this Diocese, and that it would be a more difficult physical feat to seat an entire race in Convention than to seat all the clergy of England in its two Convocations. Besides, why were not Messrs. Saltus and

Quarles subjected to similar conditions by the Standing Committee when they applied? We are next told that in 1846 a colored congregation in New York applied for admission into union with Convention, and that the application was declined. To this it is replied that the question now before us is *not* upon the admission of a colored congregation. S. Mark's applied once, twelve years ago. It has never renewed its application.

After all, these doings of long ago are no guides for us now. One might as well ask for a return to the days of the stage-coach and the mail-rider. That certain things were done in a certain way many years ago does not prove that they were *rightly* done even then, and certainly they are not binding upon us now. Our business and duty are to inquire for ourselves what is right, just, fair, honorable, Christian, and to try and do *that*.

But we are told in the chapter on Erastianism that to force the colored people into Convention will probably bring like trouble into the Church as their entrance into civil rights brought upon the State. It is difficult to trace the parallelism here suggested. No *reconstruction* measures are proposed here. The Convention has refused admission to the only colored congregation that has asked for it. A false issue is raised here again. The real point of consideration is, Whether *any man*, of any color, who has been found worthy and well qualified by the proper authorities to bear the Church's commission, and has been ordained to go and do the work of a priest in the Church of God, and who is constitutionally and canonically qualified to be in Convention, shall be excluded from the Convention of the Diocese in which he is doing his work as a priest in the Church of God? *That* is the sole question before us. Shall a man whose moral character is flawless, whose learning is adequate, and who bears the commission of the Church, be excluded from the Convention *only* and *solely* because he is not white? It would seem that if a man has been found sufficiently learned and of sufficiently unexceptional morals to be ordained a presbyter in the Church, he is sufficiently qualified to have a seat and voice in the council of his Diocese. If he is qualified for the one position he is also qualified for the other. Later on we are told what the Rev. Dr. Palmer said in the late General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church. He thought that "ecclesiastical and spiritual relations in office draw after them

social relations and social equality." At every term of court in the South the best gentlemen in the land are seen serving on juries with colored men; at the bar, white and colored lawyers are often associated together in the same court and case; in the legislature the same thing occurs; why do not these professional and civil relations draw after them social relations and social equality? If *these* do not, why should the *others*?

To say that "if these (colored) people are proper and fit to be members of the Convention, they are fit to be our social guests," is about as true as to say that if Flipper was fit to receive his commission as a lieutenant in the United States Army, he was therefore fit to be the social guest of his brother officers. He may have been *fit*, but he was *never* socially received as a guest by the other officers. Yet they recognised his *official* position, and that is all and only what colored presbyters *desire* or *expect* from us. It is not every abstract right that is granted, and no one who is not silly or fanatical claims that it is or always ought to be.

12. The *contra mundum* question is next discussed. An ingenious attempt is made to turn the tables and make it appear that the clergy, in adhering to what they honestly believe to be the only legitimate construction of the Constitution, are attempting a thing *contra mundum*. The old bugbear of *social equality*, the "bloody shirt" of ecclesiastical politics, is paraded again, in this connection, and it is sought to make out that the clergy are trying to effect that result. The clergy indignantly repudiate the insinuation; they are neither fools nor fanatics, and they are not to be turned aside from their convictions by such senseless clamor. As to their influence, clergymen have long since realised to their soul's health and that of their people, that the only influence they now have is what they are able to conquer by force of intellect, character, and example. This influence may be temporarily impaired by the prejudice now existing against them on account of their position on the subject under discussion, but it would be *fatally and finally lost*, should they render that absolute and slavish submission which it appears is now demanded by laymen, some of whom are not communicants of the Church which they claim to have the right to govern. The last one of them had better leave the Diocese before they submit to such ignominy. Even clergymen have some rights which laymen are bound to recognise if not respect,

and one of those is the right to think and act for themselves. They instance Noah as *contra mundum*, but GOD was on Noah's side. Do the laymen claim that He is on their side now? If so, why? They instance Gaiileo. The *truth* was on his side. Are the laymen sure it is on their side now? Phillips and Garrison were against the world at one time; why do not the writers of this pamphlet instance them, and claim them as companions in misery? So was Wilberforce, so were a thousand others. But the argument is very weak at best. They rightly conclude that it is not so much a matter of concern whether the *world* is against them or not, as it is to be right. Only let them mete out the same measurement to those who differ from them, let them concede that those who thus differ believe as strongly as the laymen do, that *they are right*.

Here also it is again stated that the object and effect of the seating of a colored presbyter in Convention is and will be social equality. They say: "In no Church or denomination of Christians in the South has *this effort* been made to *force* social equality upon its people but in the Conventions of the Episcopal Church." While this statement is *absolutely* and *positively* denied, at least so far as it relates to any of our South Carolina clergy, let us quote from a letter written by Mr. W. C. Benet to the *Augusta Chronicle* from Abbeville, S. C., and bearing date March 31, 1886, containing expressions which it is certain the clergy of South Carolina will *endorse*. And if it be held that the clergy are doing this thing ignorantly, the quotations will show, either that fears of social equality are groundless, or that Mr. Benet, like the Bishop, has changed his mind. Mr. Benet's testimony, and of course he knows, is that "he, and he only, has the *right* to speak seriously of amalgamation by intermarriage;" who to the test question, "Will you let your daughter marry a negro?" answers "Yes." He further says: "A negro nurse rocks the white man's cradle; a negro nurse arrays him for the grave; and negro servants and neighbors shed honest tears at his funeral. There is the most cordial friendship between white man and negro, and yet no social intercourse. Neither seeks it nor will ever seek it." This, coming from one of the authors of the pamphlet, not eighteen months ago, ought to satisfy and allay the last lingering fear on the part of the laity, that even if the clergy desired it and were working for it, it is impossible of accomplishment, owing to that "instinctive race antipathy" which forbids it.

It is delightful to see what a deep and abiding interest in Church work among the colored people is felt — and manifested, it is presumed — by the writers of the pamphlet and those for whom they speak. But again is the old confusion made between the question now before us as a Diocese and the other and distinct question of *colored LAY representation* in Convention. This latter question is *not* before us, and *has not been* for *eleven* years. The sole question before us now is the question, whether a colored presbyter who has met every requirement of the Canons of the General Church as to character and intelligence, and who possesses every qualification imposed by the Constitution upon those who seek to come into Convention, shall have his right denied, and his name stricken from the Clergy roll of his Diocese, *only* and *solely* because he is *not white*? That is the question. The question of organisation came out of that, but the underlying and essential question is what has been stated above.

To follow all the sinuosities of the pamphlet is a trying task, but it is said again, "Clergymen tell us that when converted the negroes have the right to come in and take part in our Church government, and that they must be admitted to our Conventions."

In reply to this, this distinct challenge is offered: Bring *one* clergyman who says this. Produce but one single clergyman in the Diocese who has said this or anything like this, and we yield the point. Until then the statement is *absolutely* and *unequivocally denied*. It is a vicious and unjust statement, and it is prejudicial to the clergy, who would indignantly repel the charge, *let who will make it*.

The pamphlet [p. 44. *et seq.*] goes on to say that in withdrawing from the Convention they left it disorganised, and it so continued until its close.

They base this statement upon the alleged fact that the Constitution requires, in a vote by Orders, that a majority of the lay deputies (*not present*, but) *elected* by each Church should vote, and that a majority in both Orders shall be necessary to a decision. They instance the case of the election of a Standing Committee, which must be done by Orders and by ballot, and the conclusion drawn is that if such election is not found to be the result of the choice of a *majority of all the delegates elected to represent the parishes*, and a *majority of the clergy present*,

it is no election. They go on to say that in 1887, one hundred and seventy-two deputies were elected, of whom seventy-two attended the Convention. Applying their own logic, if all who attended as deputies — the entire seventy-two — had remained in Convention and voted, no Standing Committee could have been elected, because seventy-two is not a majority of one hundred and seventy-two. They say expressly that the Constitution does not mean a majority of those *present*, but of those elected. Hence, if ever less than a majority of those elected should fail to attend or vote, no election under Art. VII of the Constitution can take place. Are the writers of the pamphlet ready to stand by the results wrought out by the application of their own logic to Diocesan records? Let us see.

In 1887, 172 lay deputies were elected ; 72 attended. Majority 87						
1886, 162	"	"	"	74	"	82
1885, 176	"	"	"	50	"	89
1884, 180	"	"	"	69	"	91
1883, 177	"	"	"	86	"	89
1882, 144	"	"	"	44	"	73
1881, 163	"	"	"	61	"	82
1880, 202	"	"	"	82	"	102
1879, 144	"	"	"	49	"	73
1878, 184	"	"	"	78	"	93
1877, 164	"	"	"	82	"	83
1876, 177	"	"	"	61	"	89

If the reasoning of these gentlemen is correct, no Standing Committee, from 1876 to 1887, has been legally and constitutionally elected. And if the election in 1887 is invalidated because of the fact that *less* than a majority of those elected as deputies failed to appear and vote, then every other like election, from 1876 to the present time, is also invalidated. And if the journals of the Diocese, prior to 1876 were consulted, we venture to say that it will be found that in *no* Convention ever held in this Diocese was there ever a majority present of those *elected* as deputies. Do the writers of the pamphlet commit themselves to *this* proposition? If so, we have nothing further to say on this point. If *they* can afford to occupy it, let them. The extraordinary feature of it is, that the two paragraphs, — 3 and 4, on page 47, — being in such close juxtaposition, should not have caused them to see the glaring absurdity into which they were betrayed, in taking the position that when the Constitu-

tion said "a majority from each Church," it meant a majority *not* of those *present* from each Church at the Convention, but a majority of *all the delegates elected* by each parish or congregation to represent it in Convention. There is *no* escaping the position in which they have thus placed themselves. They have actually burnt the bridges behind them, so carefully have they guarded against the possibility of misconstruction of their meaning.

13. The application of the *money test* follows next in the pamphlet. Accepting their figures for what they are worth, they go to show not that the views of those who seceded are entitled to consideration, for the money test can never show that, but only that the representatives of a large number of parishes chose a method of trying to enforce their views which went far beyond anything heretofore attempted in the history of the Diocese. Failing to get their own way they *threatened* to, and *tried* to break up the Convention. They failed also in that, and they seek now to justify their course by applying a numerical and *money test* to the statistics of the Diocese, to show how numerous are the people they represent, and how much they gave to the various funds of the Diocese. It is a method of argument that may have some weight with the unthinking, and those who gauge every cause by the length of its purse and the force of its numbers; but none of these things will move those who would prefer to yield their opinions on what the writers of this pamphlet reiterate is a mere "question of expediency," rather than (to quote Mr. Prentiss' language, p. 5) "interrupt the peace of the Church or impede the glory of God." And, moreover, let them permit themselves to be reminded of the possible warning to themselves that may be found in their language addressed to the clergy, on page 40: "Be careful, we pray you, that (in applying the test of money and numbers) *your own opinion* is not unconsciously influenced by . . . the subtile influences of wealth and power."

The pamphlet now concludes with a restatement of the matters in issue as seen by the writers, and an appeal to the laity to *judge for themselves* as to their future course. We only hope that they will do so in the fear of God, and in the spirit of their LORD. It certainly would appear strange to any one not cognisant of the facts, that in all this discussion, extending now over three years and more (*twelve* years, according to the

pamphlet), *not one attempt* has been made by the laity to bring about a conference between their representatives and the Bishop and his clergy, that it might be ascertained whether or no an eirenicon might be found. More than that, no layman, in all this controversy, has as yet approached the *Bishop*, to see if a settlement could not be agreed on. No; every year they have made up their plans, utterly regardless of the clergy, and they have pursued those plans determinedly throughout, but in every instance have failed to carry their point. Has it never occurred to them that it might be possible, they *loving* the Church and the Clergy loving it also, to arrange a *modus vivendi*, peaceably, quietly, and without "unseemly conduct and struggle," such as has disfigured the councils of the Church for the last three years? Are they unwilling to concede to the Clergy, especially after their unanimous endorsement of the resolution, asking them most earnestly and affectionately to return to their seats in the late Convention, some degree of the feeling of sorrow and distress, when they saw most venerable laymen, long servants of the Church, leave her Convention? Surely they should remember as applicable to their methods in this controversy, the force of the homely adage which says, "One man may lead a horse to the water, but twenty cannot force him to drink." Whatever may have been the laymen's meaning and intention in what they did, the fact is the clergy, most if not all of them, believed and felt that an effort was making to force them into doing what they did not believe to be just, fair, constitutional, or Christian. Are clergymen to have and exercise no right to make up their own minds and abide by their own convictions? Has it come to pass that the entire government of the Church, and the entire power of legislating for it, shall be vested in the laity?

What do the laymen desire? They *rejected* the clergy list as reported by the Committee on Credentials, *in toto*. Yet they say they are denied the right to scrutinise and pass upon the clergy list. This is their repeated cry, and yet they have more than once rejected the clergy list — refused to receive it as reported by the Committee. What do they mean? Is it possible they desire to claim for the laity the right to make up such a list of clergy as they choose, when the Bishop is the only person who knows, who possesses the evidences of the fact, that such and such persons are clergymen resident in the Diocese;

and when, moreover, the organic law of the Convention determines that *he must and shall* make up the list? Why do not these eminent representatives of the laity put in writing just exactly what they wish? Let them put forth in language easy to be understood what it is they demand as a condition of the restoration of peace. Let them state precisely what they are willing to do or concede for that purpose. Never once have they done this, or anything approaching it. They have treated the clergy throughout as not worthy their notice or their trust, and yet have adroitly managed to place the entire odium on the clergy's innocent shoulders. The reference on page 29 of the pamphlet to the "delegate who made the appeal" having in his hand at the time a measure looking to peace, etc., seeks further and most unfairly to lay the weight of odium on the Bishop. Yet the "proposition" is not given — no opportunity is afforded the Church at large of saying whether it was a "fair basis of settlement" or not. If it promised so well, why was it not published? Why was not the secession delayed until that experiment was tried? Why is it not published now, that between now and the next Convention all interested may have the opportunity of "scrutinising and passing upon" it? Is it not a tremendous reflection on men who profess to love the Church so devotedly that, having in their hands an "olive branch," they should have withheld it, and sought, instead of presenting it, to break up the Convention? Is it not a gross moral outrage, unworthy of Christian men, to bring, or seek to bring, the whole weight of public prejudice and odium upon a set of men who have acted always on the defensive, and never on the offensive, and whose profession debars them from adopting methods of defence, which, if they did adopt, these very men who have sought to prejudice the world against them and impair their hard-won influence would be the first to hurl it into their teeth, that in so doing they were dishonoring their cloth? And we are to sit quiet under it, to raise no hand to ward off the fast and heavy blows that are showered down upon us, to lift no voice even to disclaim, as we do most positively and resolutely, that we are seeking to do, or even are ignorantly doing, our Church, our State, our friends, any wrong or injustice whatever. Again, let it be said: better that every clergyman should leave the Diocese than submit to a slavery that is absolute and despotic. Better surrender their commissions, better starve,

than sacrifice their manhood and their independence, for, unless "all the world" has lied, life without these is not worth living.

The clergy should understand that to yield to what *seems* to be the claim of the writers of this pamphlet, is to put their title to seats and votes in the Convention in jeopardy. If they can eject Mr. Pollard without cause assigned, they can eject every other clergyman against whom they may happen to entertain an objection, and *assign no cause*. Are the clergy prepared for that? If not, then let them *never consent* to give over the organisation of the Convention and their rights and privileges therein, into the hands of those who have no more right there than they have, and are no more entitled to consideration than they. They are their peers, no more, but no less, in Convention, and perhaps out of it also. This is all the clergy claim. More than this they do not wish; less than this they will not have.

And, once more, the great underlying question before this Diocese, and the only one, is, Shall we eject from the Council of the Church, and strike from the list of the clergy, the name of a man who has met every test of character and intelligence that the Church, of which this Diocese is a constituent part, has seen fit to make, and who, after strict trial and due examination, has had conferred upon him the Order and "Office of a Priest in the Church of God" by the proper authorities of the Church, and who, holding modestly in his hand his commission as an ordained priest, together with the Constitution and Canons of the Diocese, comes to us and says: "This commission tells you who and what I am. The Constitution and Canons prescribe the qualifications I am to meet. I am ready to meet them all." Shall we turn *that man out*? Shall we make void his commission in part, by affirming that he is *not* what it says he is, in that from the Bishop's clergy list we strike off his name? Shall he be made by us not exactly "the man without a country," but "the priest without a Diocese?" This is the question we are called on to answer.

And, in conclusion, have the laity of the Diocese reflected upon the *fact* that up to this point the clergy have been alone in making a sacrifice for what they thought was the peace and harmony of the Church in South Carolina? The clergy have consented to disfranchise the deacons. In doing so they believed it would advance the cause of peace, and remove a

stumbling-block out of the laity's path, in that no *colored* deacon could come into Convention.

This proposed change in the Constitution was suggested and urged by Mr. C. G. Memminger three years ago. But now that the suggestion has been accepted and acted on, *its own author declaims against it*. Does not he, an aged and influential Churchman, owe it to his friends and brethren to explain *why* and *how* he came to change his mind upon a point so important as this?

Moreover, I believe, and have evidence going to show, that nearly, if not quite *every* clergyman in this Diocese is willing now, and has from the beginning been willing, to coöperate with the laity in effecting a separate organisation for the colored people in our midst, if such an one is proposed as is consistent with the principles and practice of the Church. More than this it is simply impossible to say. If the laity are half as anxious as the clergy to get this great question settled, and will condescend to say so, there is not the slightest doubt that it can and will be settled.

JOHN KERSHAW.

THE AMERICAN CHURCH BUILDING FUND COM- MISSION.

IN the *Church Review* for January, 1883, Mr. W. G. Low contributed an admirable article on this Commission, which very fully stated its origin, history, objects, and claims. In the present article, therefore, I do not propose to go over the ground then so satisfactorily covered, but to speak of the work of the Commission as it has actually progressed since that time, and to answer certain objections which are found to exist in some minds as to that work or its methods.

That the extension of CHRIST's Kingdom on earth is a part of our bounden duty; that that Kingdom cannot be permanently established in new localities without the existence of church buildings; that the Church people in such communities are usually few and comparatively poor, and unable of themselves to undertake and complete such a work; that the Church at large, by extending its aid, can greatly hasten the time of such permanent extension of its influence; that, especially in the West, delay is dangerous and often destructive, as communities rapidly become settled, and their habits and institutions fixed; all these are things which will be universally admitted.

It was to organise and systematise this branch of Church work that the Church Building Fund was established at the General Convention of 1880.

While the progress of this fund has not been as rapid as was hoped, yet it has steadily increased. It had reached,

On February 1, 1882	\$12,812
" March 1, 1883	34,694
" February 1, 1884	52,880
" January 1, 1885	57,289
" January 1, 1886	63,835
" January 1, 1887	69,249
" July 1, 1887	81,083

Gifts of \$5,000 each from Mr. William G. Low and Mr. Cornelius Vanderbilt in 1882, and a legacy of \$4,000 in 1885, served to swell the increase in those years. During the first three years, to September 1, 1883, the receipts for the Permanent Fund were \$46,455.43. Then they fell off, as three years was the period first suggested for raising the entire fund, and some thought that the effort was now over. The inauguration of the "Enrollment Plan" by zealous Churchmen of Philadelphia also affected our progress, by concentrating the efforts of a number of old friends on the newer project. The result was that only \$22,038 was received during the second triennial period, making the amount, as reported to the late General Convention, \$68,493.91.

While the fund is thus in process of accumulation, it has been far from idle. As the income was too small to be of much service, and calls for aid were constant and urgent, prominence was given to the loan system, a large portion of the fund being invested in loans to parishes and mission-stations that needed such help in order to build churches or rectories.

This system has been found to work admirably. There are many localities where a loan is as efficacious as a gift, and in its ultimate effect even better. This is especially the case in rapidly growing communities where all that the people need is temporary assistance in order to hasten the time when they are able to erect a church, and where they are entirely willing to repay all that is thus advanced to them, in the shortest time possible.

These loans being a part of the investment of the Permanent Fund, have, of course, to be made in a business-like and accurate manner. The Commission has been fortunate in having among its officers gentlemen like Mr. Vanderbilt, Mr. Low, and Mr. Cutting, of widespread reputation for business skill and judgment, who devote much time to its affairs, and under whose guidance, together with the faithful watchfulness of the Rev. Dr. Malcom, everything is conducted with the greatest care. Thus far not a dollar of any investment has been lost, and loans are being repaid with commendable promptitude. These loans are made payable in equal instalments during five years, and while in some cases, where good cause is shown, the time has been extended, yet, in a number of instances, the payments have been anticipated.

The triennial report made at Chicago showed that during the preceding fiscal year no less than \$5,140 of the principal of loans had been returned to the treasury. This fact alone, if properly considered, exemplifies better than any argument the value to the Church of money placed in this fund. Let us observe it a moment. This \$5,000 had been out once and had done its work in helping to build churches in more than a dozen places. It came back to the treasury, ready to go out again on its errand of church extension, and ere now has assisted in building its second set of churches. Meanwhile, the interest derived from it was subject to use in donations to places where loans will not avail.

If this \$5,000 had been given to some other object, no matter how worthy, it would have been used up, and its power for good exhausted by its single use; while here we have the principal already used twice, the interest available for gifts, and the whole sum still intact, ready to go on repeating its good work till the millennial day.

Down to the time of the last General Convention, seventy-nine loans had been authorised to aid in church building in no less than thirty-nine Dioceses and jurisdictions. Since that time full fifty more have been voted, making over one hundred and thirty in all. These have generally been to assist in the original erection of churches in weak communities, but in a few cases timely aid has been extended to save church property previously mortgaged from foreclosure and loss. Interesting instances of this kind could be given.

So much good has already been accomplished, even in the day of small things. But the present difficulty is, that the fund is so utterly inadequate to meet the constantly increasing demands upon it. We need the whole million dollars in order faithfully to perform the work that is around us. But even to meet the most pressing cases, — those which cannot wait, — a quarter of a million is necessary. So a special effort was inaugurated at the beginning of this year, to augment the fund as rapidly as possible. A leading feature of this movement was increased activity on the part of the Diocesan Commissioners, many of whom had previously seemed to consider their positions little more than honorary. Appeals have been made by these Commissioners in a large number of Dioceses; many Bishops have specially commended the Building Fund in their

annual addresses; resolutions recommending annual offerings in every parish have been passed in Diocesan Conventions all over the country; in several Dioceses, as in Pennsylvania and Long Island, influential auxiliary committees have been appointed; and public services or meetings in furtherance of the cause have been held in New York, Philadelphia, Brooklyn, Boston, Providence, Hartford, New Haven, Rochester, Geneva, Newark, Hoboken, Orange, Erie, Cleveland, Detroit, Indianapolis, Michigan City, Chicago, and St. Louis. The result of all this has been very satisfactory. While no large gifts have been received, yet the Permanent Fund increased \$11,833 during the first six months of the year. This was evidence of enhanced interest, as it was more than double the whole amount received in 1886. A most gratifying circumstance is the widespread nature of this interest. During those six months two hundred and forty different parishes sent offerings; and while this is but a small fraction of the whole number in the Church, yet it is more than ever contributed in an equal time before, even in the fresh enthusiasm of 1881. Another gratifying fact is the interest shown in remote parts of the country, and in localities that hitherto have not contributed. Louisiana, Nebraska, Nevada, and Wyoming, which had never before aided the cause, sent offerings; and the largest comparative parish gift in the country came from Ashland, Nebraska. An illustration of the result of systematic work by Diocesan Commissioners is seen in Connecticut, where heretofore no more than four parishes have ever contributed in a year, while during these six months no less than seventeen sent offerings.

During the spring, at the request of a gentleman who wished to have his Diocese speedily raise its full proportion of the entire fund, a table was prepared with much care, in the endeavor to ascertain what is a fair distribution among the Dioceses and jurisdictions in the United States in the raising of a million dollars.

In making the calculation various factors and circumstances were taken into consideration, among them: 1, the number of communicants; 2, the comparative wealth of each locality; 3, the number of "strong parishes" of various sizes; in order that the table thus constructed might be, as nearly as possible, a fair and accurate index of the actual financial ability of each Diocese.

In order to show clearly the progress of the work thus far,

American Church Building Fund Commission. 417

this table is reproduced here, with the list of contributions at the beginning of this year and also on July 1 :—

	Quota.	Contributions Jan. 1, 1887.	Contributions July 1, 1887.
Alabama	\$ 8,500	—	—
Albany	39,000	\$1,151.87	\$1,339.31
Arkansas	1,800	5	10
California	10,300	364.85	376.65
Central New York . . .	34,200	525.86	611.56
Central Pennsylvania . .	21,400	1,245.63	1,347.14
Chicago	19,500	140.97	249.49
Connecticut	60,100	313.71	579.89
Delaware	5,800	121.32	126.32
East Carolina	5,100	24.81	44.27
Easton	6,700	5.06	55.12
Florida	4,200	19	23.80
Fond du Lac	5,000	111.93	116.97
Georgia	10,200	75	152.25
Indiana	10,100	177.05	257.83
Iowa	9,700	65.33	77.83
Kansas	2,600	45.55	55.55
Kentucky	11,100	1.50	34.50
Long Island	47,500	10,286.89	10,897.91
Louisiana	8,600	—	30
Maine	5,400	109.32	115.82
Maryland	66,400	1,011.18	1,204.03
Massachusetts	59,900	7,292	9,992.40
Michigan	21,400	421.74	423.59
Milwaukee	10,700	118.47	150.43
Minnesota	11,800	663.69	814.10
Mississippi	4,600	12	41.20
Missouri	13,800	26.40	26.40
Nebraska	2,800	—	66.56
Newark	31,900	1,225.09	1,444.53
New Hampshire	4,900	268	431.32
New Jersey	25,900	5,247.48	5,322.13
New York	117,200	14,317.72	16,264.76
North Carolina	6,400	76.70	121.54
Ohio	20,700	5,682.38	5,933.43
Pennsylvania	84,300	8,045.64	9,550.59
Pittsburgh	19,000	1,433.92	2,087.97
Quincy	4,200	32.73	51.29
Rhode Island	21,400	593.45	736.45
South Carolina	10,600	59.63	78.63
Southern Ohio	17,400	2,211.06	2,451.59
Springfield	5,700	83.03	121.03

	Quota.	Contributions Jan. 1, 1887.	Contributions June 1, 1887.
Tennessee	\$8,800	\$134.50	\$154.05
Texas	4,800	44.95	68.30
Vermont	7,800	117	117
Virginia	31,100	40.76	140.76
Western Michigan . . .	6,300	154.92	155.92
Western New York . . .	32,100	3,112.14	4,347.11
West Virginia	4,800	289.56	313.09
Colorado	2,900	72.54	92.54
Dakota, North	800	2	2
Dakota, South	1,800	254.86	263.36
Idaho	400	30.65	30.65
Montana	1,400	16	31.70
Nevada	400	—	20
New Mexico and Arizona	200	119.65	148
North California	1,500	189.50	189.50
North Texas	1,900	20.75	22.85
Oregon	1,700	151.50	156.80
Utah	700	55	80
Washington	800	56.45	56.45
West Texas	1,700	100	100
Wyoming	300	—	3.25
Foreign	—	413.92	413.92
Miscellaneous	—	260	360
	\$1,000,000	\$69,249.63	\$81,083.43

A brief study of this table reveals some singular things. Four Dioceses have already raised one fifth of their quotas, — Long Island, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Ohio. Five others have contributed over one tenth of their quotas, — New York, Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Southern Ohio, and Western New York. On the other hand, there are thirteen that have not yet sent one dollar on the hundred of their proper proportion, — Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, East Carolina, Easton, Florida, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, South Carolina, and Virginia. This would seem discouraging enough were it not that a number of those very Dioceses, especially Connecticut, Easton, Kentucky, and Mississippi, have shown an earnest awakening during the last six months, and have more than doubled their previous contributions during that time. Another encouraging feature is that while, during the six years before

last January, there were five Dioceses and jurisdictions which had not contributed a cent, within six months thereafter four of these had retrieved their reputation, leaving Alabama alone as a non-contributor.

A few comparisons will show the value of work and organisation. The quotas of Connecticut and Massachusetts are almost identical, — about \$60,000 each; yet the former has responded with \$9,992, and the latter has only sent \$579. This would seem strange until we knew that in Massachusetts there has always been an active local organisation; while in Connecticut, until this year, the commissioners have done almost nothing. Again, Central New York and Western New York have very similar quotas, the former \$34,200 and the latter \$32,100; yet in the first only \$611 has been raised; while from the second \$4,347 has been received. This is accounted for by the fact that in Western New York the Convention has designated a particular Sunday on which offerings shall be received in all churches; while in Central New York there has been no organised effort.

If we turn to the cities, New York, Philadelphia, Brooklyn, Boston, and Cincinnati have all aided materially; while Washington has only done moderately well, and Baltimore very little. Chicago has sent but \$110, and St. Louis not a dollar. Cleveland, renowned among Western cities for its wealth, has done magnificently; while Providence, similarly celebrated at the East, has not yet responded as expected. It should be remembered, however, that in New York, Brooklyn, etc., the money has come mostly from individuals, and not from churches.

We trust that before the year is out a material change will have taken place in the aggregate receipts from many of the Dioceses; and with the present activity of the Diocesan Commissioners, many of whom heretofore have done little or nothing, there is good reason to expect it.

I propose now to take up some of the more common objections urged against the Building Fund and its work.

I. The first objection that manifested itself was on account of the supposed "tying up" of money in a great fund. "The Church needs the money now," was said. "Calls of all kinds are very pressing, and every dollar that can be raised should be used for present demands; the future can take care of itself." There was a great deal of good sense in this objection. If the great principal of the fund was really to be tied up, it was a

grave misfortune; for, in this growing country, where new communities are being formed and their character fixed, every day in the year "*now*" should be the watchword of Church work, To wait is to lose vast opportunities; to stop is to let the unceasing tide of immigration pass beyond our influence.

But the introduction of the system of loans completely met this objection. Under it, the principal of the fund is always actively at work. No sooner does a dollar reach the treasury than it is loaned to aid in the erection of some needed church. It is never idle. In fact, it is the most useful money in the world; for each dollar completes its cycle of usefulness in one place in five years, and then starts out on a new mission of church-building benevolence, and so continues in this round of work until in a century it will have aided to build twenty churches, besides what is accomplished through the use of its interest. So this objection may be set aside, because the state of facts upon which it is based does not exist. There is no "tying up," and no postponement of usefulness.

2. Another erroneous idea, of which it may be well to speak, is that the fund is intended to operate entirely in the West, on the borders of the country. Naturally its most extensive field is there; but the Building Fund has no such limited scope. It is to operate wherever, throughout the whole country, opportunities for usefulness exist; and cases are to be found in the more sparsely settled parts of the old States full as pressing as any in the West. In the forests of Maine, in secluded valleys of the Alleghanies, among the great colored population at the South,—yes, even in the richer Dioceses and almost under the shadow of great cities,—there is plentiful need of the aid which it affords. One of the most interesting illustrations of the value of this Fund, a case in which a landed property of large present and very great prospective value was saved to the Church from imminent peril of sale under foreclosure, after all other means of relief had failed, occurred in the wealthy Diocese of New York, and within a few miles of its great metropolis.

In one way the Building Fund will be more useful to weak Dioceses in the older parts of the country than to the distinctively missionary fields; for there is a kind of romance about the great West which attracts the attention and moves the hearts of individuals to special benefactions; while in the equally hard fields of the East there is no hope for this kind of aid. Many

of the Dioceses have as much missionary work as any distinctively missionary field ; but having lost the name, they have also lost the interest which the word "missionary" creates. So they have to bear their own burdens, often with great labor and self-sacrifice, and much important work necessarily remains undone. But through this Commission the benefactions of the Church will be distributed, not by feeling or excitement or caprice, but as good judgment and careful investigation prove to be most beneficial.

3. Singularly enough, some of the objections exactly antagonise, and to some extent neutralise, each other. There are those who object to any *gift* to aid in church-building, because they think that gifts pauperise the recipients, destroy their self-respect and self-reliance, lead to building in places where churches are really not necessary, and at best are a waste of the money of the Church at large ; but they approve of loans which are made on business principles, because they afford temporary aid in new localities which will soon be rich enough to repay, they stimulate local effort, they permit the building of churches immediately when delay would be highly injurious ; in short, they extend the fostering aid which the old should give to the young and the strong to the weak.

Others are absolutely opposed to the system of *loans*, but strongly favor direct gifts. A loan may stimulate to building larger churches than are necessary ; it is apt to become a burden and an incubus ; under its weight a parish may languish and die, which if aided by a gift would have flourished and grown. "If the Commission is to be a Loan Association, I shall regret every dollar that has gone to it from this Diocese," wrote one of the best of men, who held this view.

Now, each of these opposite opinions contains truth as well as error. Each is true of certain places and certain circumstances ; each is erroneous if intended to be general. Indiscriminate gifts to churches, like indiscriminate giving to every applicant on the street, would be wasteful, if not detrimental. Careless and ill-considered lending to churches, like similar lending to individuals, would bring loss to the lender and disaster to the borrower.

But there are multitudes of cases where a small gift, conditioned on the raising at home of a much larger sum, and bestowed in a locality where there is urgent need of assistance, will be of incalculable value ; and there are other multitudes

where a loan judiciously made, to a people willing and anxious to pay, but who in their day of small things need such temporary aid so as not to delay the introduction of regular Church services, will be a blessing that will affect the whole future of a community.

The combined system of the Building Fund Commission, when in full operation, will meet every imaginable case much better than a system restricted either to loans or to gifts could do it. For example, take a mission station in the South, or one of the weaker Eastern Dioceses, where a little chapel is to be built costing from \$500 to \$800. The people have strained every nerve, they have raised the last cent that is possible in their situation, and still a hundred or two dollars are lacking in order to complete the building. This is not a case for a loan. To go through the necessary business forms for a mortgage is too expensive and cumbersome for so small an amount, and besides a debt would be a sad burden and a hindrance to the doing of their part in the support of a clergyman.

On the other hand, in the rapidly developing parts of the West, those who build must consider the future as well as the present. The Church people may be but a handful, but they are sure to increase both in numbers and wealth. While paying for their lands, building their houses, and changing the wilderness into fruitful fields, they are sorely straitened for money, but they are assuring the future. They are willing to do all they can and are full of self-reliance; but it will not do to wait until they have the full ability to build, or the golden opportunity to mould their settlement into a Christian community will have passed. Neither will a prudent foresight allow them to build in such a way that the Church will be entirely inadequate in a couple of years. They do not wish any donation of money, but they do ask a loan with which they can build without delay, and whose repayment can be made gradually as they become stronger year by year. The very building of their Church tends to give this strength and make the burden a light one. Here, evidently, is a case for a loan and not a gift. It accomplishes the same object, the people feel better because they have repaid the amount, and at the same time not a dollar of money has been permanently taken from the Fund.

The two plans working together, so that either a gift or a loan can be made according to the circumstances, constitute

a general system as perfect as anything human can be. And as a safeguard against the granting of aid to places where it is inexpedient that a church should be located, or where the ambitious ideas of the people are leading them to desire to build a larger edifice than is necessary, besides the information gathered from various quarters, there is the requirement of the approval of the Bishop. This is an absolute requisite for any application for aid. And it is not a mere form, as many may suppose. Only a very short time since an application in a Missionary District, which seemed most worthy on its face, and which came from a very earnest and zealous missionary, was vetoed by the Bishop, who remained firm in his disapproval, though repeatedly importuned to consent, on the ground that there was no certainty of a permanent population in the place in question. These episcopal disapprovals are not infrequent, and form a safeguard of very great importance.

4. Another objection, raised generally in cities or the thickly settled Eastern States, is that the loans from the Church Building Fund are of no real benefit, as they could easily be procured from some neighboring bank or capitalist. But in its baldest form, this objection came from one clergyman in the following words: "I can get all the money I want cheaper and with far less trouble, from any bank in the United States, than I can from the American Church Building Fund Commission; therefore I think there is no use for such an institution in the Church."

This objection simply displays an utter ignorance of the land in which we live, outside of the money centres. The loans of the Building Fund are made at six per cent., with a proviso that if in any State the legal rate is lower, loans in that State shall be made at the reduced rate. But as matter of fact it is only in very favored parts of the country that money can be borrowed on Church property at six per cent.; and these are the sections that need no help of any kind from the Building Fund. In the sections where it is expected to do the most of its work, the ordinary rate on first-class mortgages ranges from 10 to 18 per cent., and as a rule it is impossible to raise money on Church property at all. In the Territory in which I write (New Mexico), for instance, the lowest interest on the best possible security, at any bank, is one per cent. a month; and a mortgage on property as solid as the Astor House would be at 12 per cent. a year. There are plenty of perfectly good mortgages at 18 per

cent., and the bank rate is often the same. This is not for lack of excellent security, but because in a new country there are no estates, no moneyed institutions, and no accumulated capital, seeking such investment. For a church to try to borrow, except as a favor from some member, would be useless, at any rate of interest.

This is the case all over the New West. The Commission had an application not long since from a church which was paying 18 per cent. on a mortgage; and another church, which was struggling under a debt of \$4,000 at 12 per cent., was saved from foreclosure by the timely action of the Commission, which at the urgent appeal of the Bishop made a loan at six per cent., with which the old mortgage was paid off. In fact, a Western Bishop said, in May last, that his only objection to the Building Fund was that the interest on its loans was *too low*, "for," said he, "it is almost impossible to get people to pay off a loan drawing only six per cent., even if they have the money on hand; for the vestry would rather loan out their money at 12 per cent., pay you interest, and keep the difference."

So this objection may be set down as simply the expression of an ignorance of the facts in the greater portion of our country, and especially in that in which the Commission mainly operates. If the objectors could only see the urgent requests for these loans, and the thankfulness displayed when they can be made, they would soon recognise the fact that, except in rare cases, there is no possible source from which a struggling church can obtain a loan at any reasonable rate, except from the Church Building Fund.

5. Another criticism, heard in certain localities, is that the method of making loans on mortgage cuts off from aid those Dioceses in which Church property is held by Diocesan trustees and not by individual parishes. But this is a misconception. The system of holding titles by a general corporation, so as to save Church property from the results of extravagance and mismanagement by a temporary local vestry, is fortunately becoming more and more generally adopted, and in the newer jurisdictions is almost universal. But a loan can as well be made to aid in building a church held by Diocesan trustees as by a vestry. The trustees assume no obligations, and affect no other property, by executing a mortgage on the property in a single town. In such case, of course, the bond or note is

made by the local board, and is simply secured by the mortgage on the local property, executed by the Diocesan trustees. There is not the slightest difficulty about it, and it is being constantly done.

6. All of the above objections are conscientiously made in good faith, and it is a pleasure to answer them. There is another kind of objection, which deserves neither courtesy nor consideration, but which may be mentioned simply to show the kind of obstacles that Christian work sometimes has to meet. A few clergymen,—so few as only to emphasise their singularity,—have declined to aid the Church Building Fund, because they are not sure that every Church to be aided will represent exactly the shade of Churchmanship which they prefer. I understand that the same persons refuse to support the Board of Missions or any other general Church work. Of course such ideas would be destructive to all united effort and to all organised association in the world. If one person refuses aid to a general Church institution because it may help those of slightly different views, another may do the same; and there is the end of all coöperation. In secular or unimportant matters, of course, one has the right to withdraw from any association at will, and to say in a childish way, "I won't play," whenever his peculiar notions are not accepted as absolute law. But here is a case simply of extending Christian influences where they do not now exist; of aiding Christian people to erect Christian churches in spiritually destitute localities. Would it be supposed that any but an enemy of Christianity could fail to assist?

If these narrow-minded persons could only come out into the newer parts of the country and see how Satan, sin, and death practically control; how absolutely devoid of Christianity is the general tone of society; how dangerous it is to the young who flock to the West to find themselves without the surroundings of that religious atmosphere which is so universal at the East that we do not realise what a help and restraint it is; perhaps they would learn to welcome any instrumentality which seeks the extension of Christian influence and the building up of churches in which not only is the gospel to be preached, but whose very existence will stand as a reminder of better things, and a rebuke to the prevalent desecration of the LORD's day and forgetfulness of God.

But obstructionists of this class have been so few that I

should not occupy this much space with them. The worst punishment I could wish them would be to read the scores of warm, loving letters constantly received, full of words of zeal and earnestness, bringing messages of encouragement and good cheer, all breathing the one thought of love for the Church of CHRIST; the one prayer, "Thy Kingdom come." Before such a glorious exhibition, how infinitely mean must the man feel who, from simple narrowness of mind, would stop the spread of the glorious Gospel of peace.

Thus I have enumerated all of the objections which have been brought against the Building Fund or its system. And it will be noted, that nearly all of them seem to proceed on the idea that this system is something new and untried, and therefore proper to be criticised theoretically. But, as matter of fact, we are doing nothing experimental, but are simply following in the footsteps of similar institutions both in England and America.

The wonderful work of the English Church Building Society is well known, yet we scarcely realise its magnitude. Five years ago it was said of it: "It has helped half the parishes of England and Wales; has provided 2,000,000 of places in churches; has built, rebuilt, or repaired 7,041 places of worship; has bestowed grants amounting to \$4,449,115."

In our own country the immense work done by similar societies should put us to the blush. The Baptists, with the youngest society, have aided more than 475 buildings by loan and 350 by gift; the "American Congregational Union" has expended over \$1,400,000 in this work, using now the loan system exclusively, and has aided in building 1,570 places of worship. The Presbyterians have employed an even larger sum; last year alone they aided in erecting 183 of their churches, and altogether have thus assisted over 2,500. And the Methodists, whose Board of Church Extension is a model of perfect organisation, through its means built no less than 487 in a single year, and in all have thus erected over 3,500.

So, these four religious bodies, through their Building Commissions, have in a few years actually brought about the erection of 8,500 places of worship in the United States. They have thoroughly tried the different systems of gifts and loans, so that we have the benefit of their experience, and are travelling over old ground. This makes it almost amusing to hear some critic say, "Such a plan will not work," when it *has* worked in the most satisfactory way for a score of years.

What we need is to press on our own work to the same extent and with the same success that other organisations have done. And to do this we need the means, the full Million Dollar Fund.

What is necessary now to accomplish this result ?

1. The simple carrying out of the unanimous recommendation at two General Conventions, that each parish shall contribute annually till the million dollars is raised. If this were loyally obeyed, the fund would be complete in a time marvellously short. But it seems strangely difficult to induce the clergy to regard the behests of the highest Church authorities. The Methodists would have no difficulty in carrying out such a plan when it was once determined on ; but with us there appears to be such an intense congregationalism that the strongest recommendation or even direction goes almost for naught. Especially is this so with a portion of the city clergy. Instead of loyally proceeding to follow the formal requests of high authority, some of them seem to consider that the slightest excuse connected with their own convenience is enough to relieve them from obligation. We are confident that the laity will be glad to respond to an appeal for this most practical work whenever made, and all that we ask of the clergy is to afford them the opportunity of so doing. There are about 3,000 parishes and missions that might contribute something ; and if all made an offering, the aggregate would certainly amount to \$100,000. A regular annual offering is far better than spasmodic giving, and produces much more satisfactory results. We beg the clergy to lay this to heart, and either set a day for an annual offering, or else adopt the day recommended by the bishops, — the second Sunday in November.

2. Individual contributions. Experience has proved that the fund can be accumulated much faster in this way than by relying solely on the parishes. We need \$200,000 *now*, and we appeal to the generous, the loyal, and the zealous, to send their contributions, large or small, so that this sum can be raised without delay. Gifts of \$5,000 or more become special funds, bearing such name as the donor designates, and the locality in which the income is to be used may also be designated. No memorial can be imagined more enduring and more useful than this. Down through the ages the special fund will go on doing its good work, and keeping the name which it bears in loving remembrance. Two of these funds are already established by

Messrs. W. G. Low and Cornelius Vanderbilt, and a third will soon become a memorial of the late Bishop Robertson. The Methodists have twenty-four of these special funds, varying from \$5,000 to \$30,000 in amount, and aggregating \$274,000, as a portion of their "Church Edifice Fund." This form of memorial is earnestly commended to all who wish to honor the memory of the departed, or to perpetuate their own, in connection with active and enduring benevolence. In this connection it may not be amiss to state that the Commission has the promise of a very large gift within the present year from the banks of the Missouri River. This certainly ought to stimulate those of wealth in the older States.

3. The bishops — more than fifty in number — have signed an appeal asking for liberal donations to the fund, and recommending offerings in every parish, which shall not have acted before that date, on the second Tuesday in November. Such an almost unprecedented appeal, carrying the weight of the united American Episcopate, surely must be attended with great results. If the three thousand parishes, including most of the wealthy city churches, which have not yet sent their offerings this year, shall all loyally respond to the joint call of the Church and the bishops, the fund will be largely filled up in a single day. And this appeal should be heeded by individuals also. It designates a time for their gifts. Let all give hearty answer, in liberal offerings on that appointed day, which will then become a true day of jubilee, and will cause the spiritual deserts in our country to blossom as the rose.

L. BRADFORD PRINCE.

THE VOICE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ON EPISCOPAL ORDINATION.

ARTICLE II.

IN Elizabeth's reign we will take the different links of our chain of historical facts in their chronological order.

I. THE CONFERENCE IN WESTMINSTER ABBEY.

The lower house of Convocation had passed a resolution, which they requested the bishops to present to Parliament, in favor of the maintenance of the Roman Catholic system, which had not yet been legally set aside. The bishops were therefore the Marian bishops. In answer to this petition, a conference was ordered to be held between the Romanists and the clergy of the Church as reformed under Edward VI. There were five articles brought forward in the petition. The first three concerning Transubstantiation, the fourth the Papal Supremacy, the fifth the inherent authority of the clergy to settle matters of Faith, Sacraments, and Discipline apart from the laity.

The conference opened on March 31, 1559. Into the details of it we need not enter. The discussion on the mystery of the Holy Communion does not concern us at present. Under the fourth head, the Papal Supremacy, the paper which Dr. Horne read in the name of his party, and which, therefore, is the official declaration of the reformed clergy, the following proposition is laid down as self-evident:—

Farther: the Apostles' Authority is derived upon after ages, and conveyed to the bishops, their successors. This must be granted by the Roman Catholics; with what color else can they press obedience to the Pope's decrees? And S. Jerome is full for the point. And S. Cyprian makes no scruple to affirm that the Apostles were all equal to S. Peter by their Commission. From whence it follows that all bishops have the same authority for ordering things to edification. [Collier, vol. ii. p. 418.]

The argument then goes on with the authority of each national Church to deal with matters of rites and ceremonies.

The conference broke up owing to the refusal of the Romanists to continue the discussion on the lines agreed upon.

The above proposition covers the whole ground of the position of the Church of England on the Apostolic Succession.

The Episcopal authority is not to be swallowed up by one bishop, as the Romanists would have it; nor is it to be so disparaged as to belong to all orders of the clergy, as the Precisians, Puritans, Presbyterians, and the whole tribe of Parity-men from that day to this would assert.

The clergy who were selected to represent the reformed Church of England were Richard Cox (afterwards Bishop of Ely), Robert Horne (afterwards Bishop of Winchester), Edward Grindal (successively Bishop of London and Archbishop of York and Canterbury), Edmund Guest (successively Bishop of Rochester and Salisbury), John Aylmer (afterwards Bishop of London), John Jewel (afterwards Bishop of Salisbury), a Mr. Whitehead,* and John Scorey, Bishop of Chichester under Edward VI, and afterwards Bishop of Hereford.

These were the men who were chosen to represent the doctrines of the reformed Church, and who chose Horne to read out on their behalf the paper from which we have quoted. Here, then, we have the doctrine of Apostolical Succession laid down as one taken for granted at the very outset of Elizabeth's reign, and before the Act of Uniformity was passed.

"The Apostles' authority is derived upon after ages, and conveyed to the bishops, their successors."

II. ACT OF UNIFORMITY.

Elizabeth's first parliament met for business on January 25, 1559, and passed, on April 28, the Act of Uniformity, which ordered the Prayer Book (suppressed of course in Mary's reign) to be again taken into regular use "from and after the feast of the Natiuitie of Sainct John Baptist" (June 24).

The Act of Uniformity was bound up with the Prayer Book, not as a supplement, but as part of it, as can be seen by the table of contents:—

"The Contents of this book.

"1. An Act for the Uniformity of Common Prayer.

"2. A Preface."

And so on to 21, which is the Communion Service.

* The writer is unable with the means at his command to trace what preferment Mr. Whitehead obtained, if any.

III. THE ELEVEN ARTICLES OF 1559.

These articles, which, according to their heading, were to be read out by all the clergy "at first entry into their cures, and also after that yearly, at two several times," are entitled:—

A Declaration of certain principal Articles of Religion set out by the order of both the Archbishops Metropolitans, and the rest of the Bishops; for the Unity of Doctrines to be *taught* and *holden* of all Parsons, Vicars, and Curates, as well as in testification of their common consent in the said Doctrine, etc.

Of these the fourth and seventh are the only ones that concern us.

IV. Moreover I confess that it is not lawful for any man to take upon him any office or ministry either ecclesiastical or secular, but such only as are *lawfully thereunto called* by their high authorities, according to the *Ordinances of this realm*.

VII. Furthermore, I do grant and confess that the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Holy Sacraments, set forth by authority of Parliament, is agreeable to the Scriptures, and that it is Catholic, Apostolic, and meet for the advancing of God's glory, etc.

Taking, then, the Act of Uniformity enjoining the Book of Common Prayer and the Eleven Articles set forth by the bishops together, what do we find the voice of the Church to be in 1559?

That every clergyman had, on entry to his cure, and twice a year thereafter, to declare openly his belief in the Scriptural, Catholic, and Apostolic character of the Prayer Book, and Administration of the Sacraments, and further, that *only those who were lawfully called according to the Ordinances of the Realm* could take upon themselves any ecclesiastical ministry.

If the seventh Article was aimed at the Romanists, the fourth was directed against the Puritans; yet, both together proclaimed that the Church of England was Catholic and Apostolic, and admitted none within her ministry but those who were lawfully called thereunto.

The questions then arise, What was set forth by authority of Parliament? What were "the Ordinances of the Realm" by which a man could know if he were lawfully called to office or ministry?

The "authority of Parliament" was the Act of Uniformity which made Elizabeth's Prayer Book of 1559 a legal ordinance.

If a man wanted to ascertain the law as to who were at that time the legal ministers in England, he would have to turn to the ordinal which bore on its title-page these words :—

“The fourme and maner of making and consecratyng bishops, priestes and deacons Anno Domini 1559” [*Liturgical Services*. Queen Elizabeth. Parker Society, 1847, p. 272 *et seq.*], and the preface, differing slightly from that of the present ordinal, both prefaces are given side by side.

The Preface of 1559 :—

It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture, and ancient authors, *that from the Apostles' time there hath been three orders* of ministers in CHRIST'S Church ; Bishops, Priests and Deacons, which offices were evermore had in such reverent estimation, that no man, by his own private authority, might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as were requisite for the same, and also by public prayer, with imposition of hands, approved and admitted thereunto.

And therefore to the intent these orders should be continued and reverently used and esteemed in this Church of England : it is requisite *that no man (not being at this present Bishop, Priest or Deacon)* shall execute any of them, *except he be* called, tried, and examined, and *admitted according to the form hereafter* following. And none shall be admitted a deacon except he be xxi years of age at least. And every man which is to be admitted a Priest shall be full xxiii years old. And every man which is to be consecrated a Bishop shall be full thirty years old. And the Bishop, knowing either by himself, or by sufficient testimony, any person to be a man of virtuous conversation and without crime, and after examination and trial, finding him learned in the Latin tongue, and sufficiently instructed in Holy Scripture, may upon a Sunday or Holy day, in the face of the Church, admit him a deacon, in such manner and form as hereafter followeth.

Present Preface as revised in 1662 :—

It is evident unto all men diligently reading the holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church ; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Which offices were evermore had in such reverent Estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same ; and also by publick Prayer, with Imposition of Hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful authority. And therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed, in the United Church of England and

Ireland ; no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the United Church of England and Ireland, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination.

And none shall be admitted a Deacon, except he be Twenty-three years of age, unless he have a Faculty. And every man which is to be admitted a Priest shall be full Four-and-twenty years old. And every man which is to be ordained or consecrated Bishop shall be fully thirty years of age.

And the Bishop, knowing either by himself, or by sufficient testimony, any Person to be a man of virtuous conversation, and without crime ; and, after examination and trial, finding him learned in the Latin Tongue, and sufficiently instructed in holy Scripture, may at the times appointed in the Canon, or else, on urgent occasion, upon some other Sunday or Holy-day, in the face of the Church, admit him a Deacon, in such manner and form as hereafter followeth.

The last words of the Preface of 1662, "or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination," were added because the words in brackets of that of 1559 were omitted — (not being at this present Bishop, Priest, or Deacon). Whichever Preface is taken, there is no loophole for a non-Episcopally ordained man to creep into the sacred ministry. He must either have been a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon according to the Roman ordinal or the Edwardian ; else he must be admitted "according to the form hereafter following," to satisfy the Preface of 1559.

He must be admitted "according to the form hereafter following," if he has not already received Episcopal ordination to fulfil the requirements of the Preface of 1662.

What was "the form hereafter following" in 1559?

For a Deacon, after the candidate has declared that he believes that he has been inwardly called to enter the sacred ministry, and has been outwardly called according to the will of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, and the due order of this realm, to the ministry of the Church, the bishop lays his hand upon him, saying :—

"Take thou authority to execute the office of a Deacon," and thus the Deacon receives his mission.

For the Priesthood the question as to the inward call is omitted, the candidate having already entered the sacred ministry, but the question is asked as to whether the candidate believes himself to have received the outward call :—

434 *The Church of England on Episcopal Ordination.*

"According to the will of our LORD JESUS CHRIST and the Order of this Church of England to the ministry of Priesthood?"

The terms of the question for the Diaconate are general, but for the Priesthood they become precise.

The bishop with the priests present lay their hands on the candidate, the bishop saying:—

"Receive the Holy Ghost: Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven: and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained."*

"Take thou authority to preach the word of GOD," etc.

Here then first his spiritual power is given him in the self-same words the Apostles received theirs from CHRIST; and secondly his mission.

In the office for the consecration of a bishop, the rubric, following the Primitive Canons, insists on the presence of two bishops besides the officiating bishop. This shows the anxiety of the Reformers to guard against any possible break in the continuation of the Apostolical succession. The consecration of a bishop by only one bishop might be valid, but is uncanonical, since the Primitive Church had, in order to be sure of the succession, laid down the rule, and constantly reaffirmed it, that:—

"Let a bishop be ordained by two or three bishops."

"Let a Priest or Deacon and the other clergy † be ordained by one bishop."

Canons 1 and 2 of the Apostolical Canons.‡ The reformers enjoined the presence of three bishops, at least, at every consecration, while one was sufficient for the ordaining of a Priest or Deacon.

* The reader will notice the difference in this form from that in the present Prayer Book, which is word for word the same as the first form in the American Prayer Book. It is doubtful if the older form is not the stronger.

† That is the minor clergy, including Readers, Sub-Deacons, etc.

‡ The Apostolical Canons belong to no later date than the end of the second or the very commencement of the third century.

Canon 4 of the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, rules:—

"A Bishop ought to be constituted by all the Bishops of the Province, and should this be impracticable on account of urgent necessity, or because of distance, three at least should meet together," etc.

And so Canon 19 of Antioch, A. D. 341. A Bishop not to be obtained without a Synod and the presence of the Metropolitan of the Province.

The African code, A. D. 418, collected out of sixteen councils at Carthage, etc., rules in Canon 13, "Three Bishops may consecrate another Bishop with leave of the Primate."

Could a Church have done more to insure the Apostolical succession? Yet we are told the Church of England is indifferent on the subject.

Again, in the address to him that is to be consecrated bishop the Archbishop is to say:—

“Brother, forasmuch as Holy Scripture, *and the old canons* commandeth that we should not be hasty in *laying on hands* and *admitting* of any person to the government of the congregation of CHRIST,” etc.

And at the consecration, —

“Take the HOLY GHOST and remember thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by *imposition of hands*,” etc.

In the Confirmation service the bishop claims to be the successor of the Apostles in their apostolic functions:—

“Upon whom (after the example of thy Holy Apostles) we have laid our hands,” etc.

Throughout the most solemn parts of her service, wherever any Sacramental grace is to be given, the Church directs, beyond the possibility of any person quibbling as to the generic term “minister,” that a priest or bishop shall perform the act, as in Holy Communion, in the visitation of the sick, and Confirmation.

And wherever she refers to her Orders, she ever refers to them as a *Divine institution*.

Almighty God, which by the* *Divine providence* hadst appointed *diverse orders of ministers in the Church*; and didst inspire thine Holy Apostles to choose unto *this order of Deacons* the first martyr S. Stephen, with other: mercifully behold these thy servants now called to the like office and administration, etc.

In the Prayer for priests the language is, as we should expect, still stronger.

Almighty God, giver of all good things, which by *thy Holy Spirit* hast appointed diverse orders of Ministers in thy Church, mercifully behold these thy servants, now called to the office of Priesthood, etc.

In the exhortation following, the Church institutes a direct comparison between her Priests and the Apostles. One of the Gospels appointed to be read is chapter xx. of S. John, ending

* Misprint for “thy.” All these quotations are taken from the Elizabethan Prayer Book, as given in *Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer set forth in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*. Parker Society, 1847.

436 *The Church of England on Episcopal Ordination.*

with the words of our LORD, "and (he) said unto them: Receive ye the HOLY GHOST. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whose soever sins ye retain they are retained."

In the prayer before the imposition of hands, the bishop prays for the candidates: "Thou hast vouchsafed to call these thy servants here present to the same office and ministry" as thy "Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists," etc. Then follow the words of imposition, when the bishop, standing in the place of CHRIST,* repeats the selfsame words as the Head of the Church:—

"Receive the HOLY GHOST: whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained."

And when under that Commission the priest absolves individual penitents, the Church provides the form:—

Our LORD JESUS CHRIST, who hath left power to his Church to absolve all sinners which truly repent and believe in Him; of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences: and by his authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the HOLY GHOST.

Well has it been said:—

Orders, then, in the view of the Church of England, are (historically) an Apostolical Ordinance, but one both in itself necessary to the Church, and in its origin a direct appointment of CHRIST Himself by His Holy Spirit, with no less an end than the salvation of men's souls, and with no less a power than that of administering Sacraments and conveying instrumentally God's gift of the forgiveness of sins, and those orders, of course, are asserted to be so, and none others, that are set forth in the Ordinal itself, viz., Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, with their several powers as thus distinguished and declared—powers certainly in their own nature such as none but Almighty GOD can give, and which, therefore, only the authority of Almighty GOD can ever excuse, much less sanction, men in claiming to bestow. Beyond all power of gloss, our services are either rank and fearful blasphemy, or they rest upon the doctrine here laid down.†

To this we can only say a solemn Amen.

* "Those that fill the room of CHRIST" is the term applied to the bishops in the Homilies.

† Haddan's *Apostolical Succession in the Church of England*, Rivingtons, 1869, p. 143.

The Church recognised in 1559 (and recognises now) as her ministers only those who had Episcopal ordination, and were willing to conform to the doctrines as embodied in the Prayer Book, or those who were ordained by bishops according to the form she set forth, and emphatically declares "that no man being at the present (1559) Bishop, Priest, or Deacon" shall execute any ministerial office.

The state of the Act of Uniformity of 1559 imposes this law of the Church as the law of the realm, therefore when the "Ordinances of the Realm" are invoked in behalf of the Eleven Articles which the Church, through her archbishops and bishops, demands all her ministers to assent to, the Church invokes her own ordinances.

If a man appealed to the Ordinances of the Realm, the appeal lay to the Ordinal.

If a man appealed to the Ordinances of the Church, the appeal lay likewise to the Ordinal.

There was thus a twofold encircling of the law.

IV. A PURITAN VOICE.

It may, however, be said that to take the words of the Prayer Book, the Ordinal, or its preface, "in such just and favorable construction as in common equity ought to be allowed to all human writings" [present preface to the Book of Common Prayer], and to state that the "priest" of the Prayer Book means only the legal priest, *i. e.*, the one ordained according to the Ordinal (or according to the Roman Ordinal and willing to conform), is to take a view only taken by those having "the Church idea." It may, therefore, not be out of place to quote from a rare and curious publication entitled:—

"Certaine Considerations drawne from the Canons of the last Sinod, and other the Kings Ecclesiastical and Statute law," etc., published, as such productions mostly were, without the name of author or printer, in 1605.

Under the section devoted to "Considerations against subscription to the booke of the forme and manner of making and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons," the writer argues against subscription * to the Prayer Book being compulsory on all the clergy, and endeavors to arouse the King's jealousy as

* When we come to examine the articles later on it will be seen that the terms of subscription do not affect the present argument.

to his supremacy, and so accordingly [on pages 48, 49] proceeds:—

So that by subscription to allow that provincially and Diocesan Bishops be Scripturally Bishops, and that their jurisdiction and power is a Scripturally jurisdiction and power, is to deny that their jurisdiction and power dependeth upon the King's jurisdiction and power, or that by the King's gift and authoritie they be made Bishops.

But how doeth subscription (you will say) to the booke of Ordination approve the orders and degrees of provincially and diocesan Bishops to be by Divine right rather than by humane ordinance? How? Why thus: It is evident (saith the preface of that booke) to all men diligently reading holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' times, there have been these orders of ministers in CHRIST'S Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Yea, and by the whole order of prayer and of scripture read, and used in the forme of consecrating of an Archbishop or Bishop, it is apparent that the order of an Archbishop or Bishop, consecrated by that booke, is reputed and taken to be of Divine institution. And therefore seeing the names of those orders of ministers must necessarily be taken and understood of such orders of ministers as be sett forth and described in the body of that booke, it must needs be intended, that the ministers by their subscription should approve the orders of ministers mentioned in that booke, to be of Divine institution, and consequently that provincially and diocesan ministers or Bishops, have not their essence and being from the nomination, gift and authoritie of the King.*

Besides if we should understand by the word (Bishop) him that hath the ministrie of the word and Sacraments, as the Pastor and teacher; and by the word (Priest) the Presbyter, that is the governing elder; and by the word (Deacon) the provider for the poore, then for the ministers to subscribe to the booke of Ordination would no way justify those offices, or degrees of ministers which are described in that booke, but would indeed utterly subvert and overthrow them.

Because the orders and degrees of a provincially, and diocesan Bishop, of a Priest and Deacon, mentioned in that booke, be of a farr differing nature from those orders, and degrees of ministers which are mentioned in the Scriptures, because they only agree in name, and not in nature.

Quite so, Mr. Anonymous; and prithee, Professor Nelson, is

* What the King thought of this Erastian appeal, we have already seen in his address to Spotswood, Hamilton, and Lamb, on the eve of their consecration as Bishops for Scotland, where he said he never would presume on such authority, and "that such authority belonged to none but our blessed SAVIOUR and those commissioned by Him."

the voice of the Church so very uncertain? Our friend Master Anon., and his co-peers, Precisian, Puritan, or Presbyterian, think it only too certain, and groan that the Preface is not open to a double interpretation. The Divine right of Episcopacy was no "open question," as far as the Church of England was concerned, in the eyes of these men.

Not believing in the Divine institution of Episcopacy, and recognising that wherever, in the Book of Common Prayer, the Orders of the ministry are referred to, only those Orders of ministry are allowed by the Church that are ordained according to her Ordinal, Anonymous and his friends say "We cannot subscribe to such a book. We believe in Orders, yea, but Orders not of Divine institution, and while, if you like, we will retain the names of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, those names must not represent the Orders, having the nature of the Orders mentioned in the book of Ordination of the Church of England, but must represent Pastors, Elders, and Providers for the poor."

These men are consistent; and so is a West Virginian Priest of the American Church, who, no longer believing in his Holy Priesthood, quits a branch of the Catholic Church * having the Apostolical succession either for a sect whose originator four years from his death solemnly declared, "I will rather lose twenty Societies than separate from the Church,"† or for the latest of modern schisms, that of Cummins.

In a manifesto lately published by the Cumminsites, or, as they call themselves, the "Reformed Church of England," or "Reformed Episcopalians," they declare that they have separated from the Church of England, since, among other things, she teaches the Apostolical succession, and that they recognise and acquiesce in Episcopacy as "not of Divine right, but as a very ancient and desirable form of Church policy" [*Church Times*, London, England, April 7, 1887], and that their ministers are not priests in any other sense than that in which all believers

* To avoid personalities the name is not given, but the facts can be learned from an account published in the *Wheeling (W. Va.) Register*, March 2, 1887, as quoted by the *Sun*, of Baltimore, Md., March 4, 1887.

† See letter from Wesley, first printed in the *British Magazine* for September, 1834, and written February 21, 1787. Wesley died March 2, 1791. The whole paragraph is, "Modern laziness has jumbled together the two distinct offices of preaching and administration of the Sacraments. But, be this as it may, I will rather lose twenty Societies than separate from the Church."

are a royal priesthood. Misguided, and ignorant of the teaching of the Primitive Church, as these men are, yet they are honest. For them, as for Master Anonymous, the voice of the Church of England or of the American Church is too certain. To remain in the Church as a priest, to occupy a teaching chair, and yet to deny the Apostolical succession, — nay, more, to teach that the Church does not enjoin Apostolical succession, — is a treacherous and disloyal act to the Church that every priest has sworn to defend. Such teaching can be fruitful of but one thing — schism; and a terrible responsibility rests on those in authority who allow such teaching to continue. No doctrine of the Church is safe at their hands. The Church everywhere is in far more danger from the Nihilism of the Protestant sects than she is from Rome. The past history of the Church proves that where she has lost one joining the Roman Church, which is after all a branch of CHRIST'S Church, she has lost thousands who have joined the various Protestant bodies.

The Puritan testimony has been introduced at this point because, although not published in the period under review at present, it yet voices the seasons for the continual fight against subscription to the Prayer Book and Ordinal.

Without staying any further to reflect on these "considerations," though they are wonderfully suggestive, we pass on to the next link in the historical chain of evidence as to what the Realm and the Church considered lawful ministers before the year 1588.

V. VISITATION ARTICLES.

The Act of Uniformity of 1559 was, as we have seen, not only statute law, but ecclesiastical law, being part of the Book of Common Prayer. One of its provisions is as follows:—

Provided always, and be it ordained and enacted by the authority aforesaid, that all and singular Archbishops and Bishops, and every of their Chancellors, Commissaries, Archdeacons, and other Ordinaries having any peculiar ecclesiastical jurisdiction, shall have full power and authority, by virtue of this act, as well to inquire in their visitation, Synods, and elsewhere within their jurisdiction, or any other time and place, to take accusation and information of all and every the things above mentioned, done, committed, or perpetrated within the limits of their jurisdictions and authority, and to punish the same by admonition, excommunication, sequestration, or deprivation and other censures and processes in like form as heretofore hath been used in like cases by the Queen's ecclesiastical laws.

We must also remember that a Bishop's visitation is a *lawful court*, and clerks not appearing are liable to punishments and costs. [Phillimore's *Ecclesiastical Law*, p. 1346.]

Let us now see what were the interrogatories addressed at sundry visitations.

I. *Interrogatories in the injunctions of Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, 1561.*

17. Whether there be any laye or temporall men not being within orders, or children that hath or enjoyeth any benefice or spiritual promotion.

II. *Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1563.*

6. Item. Whether there be any Parsons that intrude themselves and presume to exercise any kind of ministry in the Church of GOD without imposition of hands and Ordinary * authority.

III. *Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, 1569.*

16. Item. Whether ye know any parson or vicar that sel their benefice to meare laymen.

IV. *Cox, Bishop of Ely (about 1570-1574).*

Item. Whether there be any Parsons that intrude themselves and presume to exercise any kinde of ministrie in the Churche of God without imposition of hands and ordinarie (see note below) authoritie.

V. *Grindal, Archbishop of York, 1571.*

36. Whether there be any lay or temporall man not being within orders or any childe that hath or enjoyeth any benefice or spirituall promotion.

VI. *Aylmer, Bishop of London, 1577.*

10. Whether any person, or persons, not being ordered at least for a Deacon, or licenced by the ordinarie, doe say Common-Prayer openly in your Church or chappell, or any not being at the least a Deacon doe solemnise matrimony or administer the Sacraments of Baptisme, or deliuer vnto the communicants the Lordes cuppe at the celebration of the Holy Communion, and what he or they be that doe so.

55. Whether any new presbyteries † or elderships be lately among you erected, and by them any ministers appointed with ‡ (sic) orders

* *I. e.*, authority of the Ordinary, the Bishop of the Diocese.

† We shall see further on that such a "presbyterie" had been established about five years previously at Wandsworth.

‡ Evident misprint for "without."

442 *The Church of England on Episcopal Ordination.*

taking of the Byshop doe baptise, minister the communion, or deall in any function ecclesiastical, or gather any priuate conuenticles whereby the people be drawn from the Church.

VII. *Sandys, Archbishop of York, 1578.*

4. Whether any Person, or persons, not being ordered at the least for a Deacon, lycensed by the Ordinary, do saye Common-Prayer openly in your Church or Chappell, or any not being at least a Deacon, do solemnise matrimonie or administer the Sacrament of Baptisme or deliuer vnto the communicants the Lord's cup at the celebration of the Holy Communion, and what he or they be that do so.

VIII. *Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1588.*

Whether doth any take on them to read lectures or preach, being mere lay persons, or not ordered according to the laws of this realm.

IX. *Alymer, Bishop of London, 1586.*

4. Whether any Parson or Parsons not being ordered at the least for a Deacon do saye Common Prayer openly in your Church Chappell, or any not being at the least a Deacon do solemnise matrimony, or administer the Sacramentes of Baptisme, or deliuer to the Communicantes the Lord's cup at the celebration of the holye communion, and what be their names that do so.*

Here, then, we have a series of Visitation Articles, commencing within two years of the passing of the Act of Uniformity and the restoration of the Prayer Book, and down to two years before the date of 1588, when we are told that the doctrine of the exclusive claim of Episcopacy as a Church government and its connection with the validity of the Sacraments *was first publicly set forth or first broached!*

There were two classes of intruders that the Church had to guard against, the men non-Episcopally ordained and minors holding the temporalities of the Church. It is a matter unfortunately too notorious that in the Roman Communion children had been preferred to benefices, and also to dignities in the Church. Pope Leo was abbot of two monasteries at the age of seven, and at thirteen was a Cardinal. Another Pope, that of

* All these Visitation interrogatories are taken from the *Second Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Rubrics, orders and directiones for regulating the course and conduct of public worship, etc., according to the use of the United Church of England and Ireland, etc., 1868*, with the exception of Whitgift's for 1585, which is taken from Cardwell's *Doc. Ann.*, vol. ii. p. 4.

Geneva, Calvin, though a layman, possessed two places of preferment in France, — he afterwards sold one of them.

Against such abuses was the question aimed, "whether there be any childe that hath or enjoyeth any benefice."

This class of abuses may be said to belong to the old order of things, while that of men not lawfully ordained belonged to the new order.

It would not, therefore, have been surprising had there been no interrogatories aimed against this new class of intruders. Silence would, however, have given no sanction. Does the Church recognise the Methodist Episcopal "Bishops" because she nowhere condemns them by name?

The attack on the Church's worship has not been fruitless of good, if by bringing to light these hidden Visitation Articles it has helped to prove the doctrine which was really aimed at through the attack on the Ornaments Rubric.

That some of the bishops from 1559 to 1588 may not have been very desirous of enforcing the law of the Church and Realm, and that they would have preferred to connive at the intrusion of men not ordained according to those laws, may be perfectly true, but even if such could be proved * beyond the shadow of a doubt, such proof would not affect the law of the Church. A judge may wink or connive at an offence, but that would not make the offence the less an offence. Nay, more, when called upon to act against the offender, the judge, no matter how he may dislike the law, has to pass sentence according to the law of the land.

In some States there are laws against the selling of liquors. Such laws are notoriously broken; and, if rumor speaks correctly, with the knowledge of the magistrates. Yet the moment the law is set in motion, a judge, although he had himself been buying liquor from the offender, would have to pass on him the sentence provided by the law. Nor, is non-user a repeal of a law. In the above Visitation Articles, however, we see clearly beyond the possibility of a cavil that there was a widespread desire to enforce the law. And it is curious to note the similarity of language employed; the Interrogatory of the Archbishop of York, of 1578, is almost word for word the same as that of the Bishop of London, of 1586. It would really seem as if the Bishops had concerted a united plan of defence against these new intruders.

* No proof of such cases has yet been given.

The Roman Orders, the Church acknowledged these, and has always acknowledged them as valid, and the law of the Realm has also always done so on the ground of their having the *Apostolical succession*, as we have seen Lord Brougham so decide. [*Church Review* for April, 1887, p. 441.]

The words in brackets in the Preface to the Ordinal of 1559—(not being at this present Bishop, Priest, or Deacon)—certainly left it open to a Roman clergyman to hold a cure legally without any further authority than the Ordinal gave him. In this there was a source of danger, for while the Church recognised the validity of his Orders, she did not desire a Roman priest to minister at her altars without first having some guarantee that he would abide by her reformed standard of doctrine and worship.

To effect this an Act was passed in the thirteenth year of Elizabeth's reign. And now we come to the fifth link in our chain of historical facts: the Act of 13 Elizabeth, c. 12, and the *Articles*.

ARTHUR LOWNDES.

(*To be Continued.*)

THEISTIC ETHICS.

Prolegomena to Ethics. By the late THOMAS HILL GREEN, Wythe's Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford. Edited by A. C. BRADLEY, M. A. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. New York: Macmillan & Co. 1884.

CARLYLE, the systematically garrulous, self-conscious apostle of anti-talk, anti-system, and anti-self-consciousness, the lamentator of the present, had nothing but contempt for any study of moral science. "The ages of heroism are not the ages of moral philosophy. Virtue, when it can be philosophised of, has become aware of itself, is sickly and beginning to decline." *

If he had lived another decade, and if in that decade he could have experienced a Sartorial Palingenesia into the larger appreciation of all man's spiritual questionings and strivings, he would have rejoiced in the ethical renaissance that is so noteworthy a characteristic of the present. Had his seer's eye lighted upon the banquet of ethical treatises that have recently appeared, he would have found in them signs of healthy life, instead of signs of "bedridden, valetudinarian impotence." He would have agreed with Emerson, that "in youth and age we are moralists, and in mature life, the moral element steadily rises in the regard of all reasonable men," and therefore not refuse to court the mistress — ethics. The present holds with Emerson, in courting this mistress. It is patent that the great English revival of philosophical studies has reached this sphere. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Moral Philosophy was much more cultivated in England than in any other part of Europe. Jouffroy, in his *Critical Survey of Moral Systems*, especially of the selfish systems, confined his attention so exclusively to English authors, that he had to justify himself against accusations of Anglomania. There came, however, a lull in this interest. But it was only temporary; and

* *Characteristics*, p. 14.

now the latter half of this century bids fair to be the brightest and best period of English thought on ethical questions, — an epoch that will be classical to future generations. Mr. Matthew Arnold's literary emphasis on conduct only slightly antedated the present earnest philosophical study of the ethical part of human phenomena. To the interpretation and comprehension of ethical experience, its origins and end, its motives and sanctions, its grounds, codes, and progress, we find leading minds of all schools of thought giving their most earnest attention. Theological ethics no longer has the field to itself. Non-theistic theories are also stanchly maintained. Neither has philosophical ethics been allowed possession of the province. Physical science claims the territory for empiricism. Utilitarians, Evolutionists, Sociologists, Humanitarians, and even Agnostics are earnestly maintaining their interpretation of conduct. Old-fashioned scepticism has been bowed out of the field. But materialistic scientists have ceased to wield the destructive sword, and have become foremost in the maintenance of ethical phenomena, and in the constructive effort to systematise them into ethical theories. The old battlefields are not those of to-day. Conciliation and agreement, the recognising "the soul of good in things evil," is the method generally adopted with reference to the older battles. Indeed, so far as the code for ordinary conduct is concerned, we find practical agreement between writers of the most opposite schools. Herbert Spencer and Leslie Stephens would give much the same code for catechetical, commercial, and social purposes as would Dr. Martineau and Bishop Martensen. Nor does the question of the diversities of ethical codes have the same polemical interest. A generation ago, sceptics always hurled the *Quot homines tot sententiæ*, as the always fatal shot at conscience and its creed. Since the historical method has been employed, this weapon has utterly lost its force. Difference of environment, of age, country, civilisation, race, are granted their influence upon codes, and a progressive development of moral ideas is now allowed and maintained by all as not incompatible with immutable morality. Authors of non-theistic ethics inculcate benevolence and self-sacrifice as categorically imperative, and insist that a man should be willing to be damned for the good of the race. Intuitionist moralists allow the place of pleasure, and the worth of utility as a help in determining just what we ought to do, while Utili-

arians maintain altruism as one, and as the highest ethical principle. Evolutionists may describe the zoölogical origin of conscience, or found the "lofty ought upon the paltry is," but they end in asserting its reality and supremacy.

The other school, on their part, are willing to admit that science and the theory of evolution may tell us much as to the historical way in which the moral sentiment and code have been realised, describe accurately the historical genesis on its physical side, but yet insist that a conscience is a conscience for "a' that," because of its metaphysical side, the moral order of the Moral Orderer.

The chief contest to-day is in regard to the origin and foundation, the efficient motive and sufficient sanction, of conscience. It is contended that its origin is natural and physical; that its foundation is in the synthesis or correlation of physical determinism; that its efficient motive is hedonistic, and its sufficient sanction the fear of the current positive codes.

If we were required to draw a line that would most distinctly and fundamentally divide the different schools of moralists to-day, we would name it the *theistic* line. Theistic and non-theistic ethics include and define all types of ethical thought. Whether man is a physical thing or a spiritual subject, whether secular morality is all that is needed, whether there is any goal beyond, any perfect ideal to be realised, whether a moral life is worth living, — all these are only secondary and included topics under the great one of the relation of Ethics to Theism.

A critical sketch of contemporary English and American Ethics is far beyond the limits of a review article. Herbert Spencer's zoölogical and human ethics in his *Data of Ethics*, with Leslie Stephen's "Ethical doctrine in harmony with the doctrine of Evolution" in his *Science of Ethics*; Dr. Martineau's "Idiopsychological" ethics in his *Types of Ethical Theory*; Janet's "Rational Eudæmonism" in his *Theory of Morals* (translated from the French), with the kindred works of Sidgwick, Porter, and Peabody; each and all of these are worthy of careful and appreciative exposition.

But if asked to name the greatest work of all; the calmest, most candid, earnest, subtle, suggestive, critical, and appreciative work of all; the most philosophical, ethical, and above all the most positively theistic volume of this epoch, I should name Professor T. H. Green's *Prolegomena to Ethics*.

Professor Sidgwick, in a polemically critical review of it in *Mind*, No. XXXIV., characterises it as the "one about which our ethical discussion is likely for some time to turn," and its author as one who "*never wrote for victory*." This is the highest praise generously accorded by one whom Green criticises very keenly in his volume. I lay it down after a studious reading, with a profound regard for the moral fervor and for the deeply religious spirit that pervades it throughout, as well as for the philosophical breadth and acumen and the close and powerful reasoning it maintains from first to last; thankful for the ethical tonic it has given as well as for the interpretation and comprehension of ethical experience which it contains. Its enthusiasm for human perfection, or well-being, in its most catholic sense, too, is nourished by the most unwavering faith that man is not the orphaned child of an absent Unknowable. Theism is the vital breath that animates the whole. I take it as the highest type of theistic as well as philosophical ethics to-day. I cannot attempt even an exposition, much less a criticism of the whole volume, which is too compact to admit of abridging without marring. I can only indicate his leading principles and results. It is another of those books which would "be much shorter, if it were not so short," which could be more easily and lucidly expanded than condensed.

The lamented author died five years ago. He is generally referred to by the Scottish philosophers as the "recognised leader of Hegelianism at Oxford." He would not have accepted this inaccurate title. He does not even mention Hegel in the whole volume. Aristotle modified by Kant, with Kant's Unknowable *Ding an Sich* translated into the self-conscious Absolute Spirit, more nearly describes his philosophical genealogy. This method is now styled the *Neo-Kantian*.* Hegel never wrote on the subjective side of the ethical question. He presents his ethical doctrine (in his *Philosophie des Rechts*) on its objective side, as realised, in the customary morality of family, community, and especially in that of the State, the highest manifestation of

* Since writing this article I have found the following estimate of Green's position by Professor E. Caird, viz.: "In philosophy Professor Green's whole work was devoted to the development of the results of the Kantian criticism of knowledge and morals. To Hegel he latterly stood in a somewhat doubtful relation, . . . regarding the actual Hegelian system with a certain suspicion as something too ambitious, or, at least, premature. 'It must all be done over again,' he once said." Preface to *Essays in Philosophical Criticism*, edited by A. Seth and R. B. Haldane.

universal reason in the sphere of practice. Kant, on the other hand, emphasised the formal, subjective good-will as the essence of morality. Green's volume also deals with the subjective side and is professedly an exposition and development of Kant.

He maintains that a metaphysic of morals is both possible and necessary, as the proper foundation of every system of ethics. The reality of the ideas of freedom and duty can only be maintained by a metaphysic that makes man to be something more than a derivative product of mere nature. If we cannot demonstrate a *meta*-nature for man, we can have no moral science other than the natural history of how men do act, not how men ought to act. For "it is obvious that to a being who is simply the result of natural forces, an injunction to conform to their laws is unmeaning." Hence, "at the risk of repelling readers by presenting them first with the most difficult and least plausible part of his doctrine," he begins with the exposition of the *metaphysic of morals*. The metaphysic of anything, we may say, is the conditions implied in its being, it is the total environment which its existence presupposes, the totality of those relations which its own analysis and interpretation imply and demand, the larger, truer self that does not appear at first glance to the naked physical eye. Such a metaphysic or meta-natural basis there must be for Ethics. As merely one of the natural sciences, it would cease to be possible. No historical research into sub-human and pre-moral conduct, coupled with laws of physical evolution, can afford an explanation of mental and moral phenomena. Back of, beneath, immanent in (*meta*) all things physical there is that by virtue of which they are their larger self. What is the metaphysics of man, mental and moral? Answered plainly in a word, it is GOD. Man alone does not create his own universe, does not exist alone, — there is not far from every one Him in whom alone one can live and move and have any real being. Proof of this, in the common sense of the word, is out of place. But it is the only conception that enables us, reflecting on our moral and intellectual experience conjointly, to put the whole cosmos of experience together, and understand how (not why) we are and do what we consciously are and do.

This theistic conception is the only key that fits into all the wards of the complicated lock of life. Such is the result of the first two books of this volume, translated out of the technical

form of the text. But I will let the author speak for himself. The First Book answers the question, "Can the knowledge of nature be itself a part or product of nature," or, otherwise stated, "What conditions on the part of consciousness are implied in the fact that there is such a thing as knowledge?" The reply to this gives the metaphysics of knowledge, and consists in an analysis of knowledge itself. He goes straight through the *hysteron-proteron* of empiricism, and the absolutely irrational subjective Idealism and its correlated Agnosticism of Kant, to the Absolute Idealism of Theism.

There is no unknowable *Ding an Sich*, nor any *mere* matter in the universe. The synthesis in man's consciousness which we call knowledge implies and demands an absolute consciousness.

Our consciousness has a history bounded by time apparently. "But this apparent state of the case can only be explained by supposing that in the growth of our experience, in the process of our learning to know the world, an animal organism which has its history in time gradually becomes the vehicle of an externally complete consciousness" [p. 72]. Again, "The attainment of the knowledge is only explicable as a reproduction of itself, in the human soul, by the consciousness for which the cosmos of related facts exists—a reproduction of itself, in which it uses the sentient life of the soul as its organ." Man's brain differs from that of animals, because it is organic to knowledge, and so is not affected by any processes of evolution, or empirical history by which his physical existence has been developed. "If there are reasons for holding that man, in respect of his animal nature, is descended from 'mere' animals—animals to whom the functions of life and sense were not organic to the eternal or distinctively human consciousness—this does not affect our conclusion in regard to the consciousness, of which, as he now is, man is the subject; a conclusion founded on analysis of what he now is and does" [pp. 77, 87]—that is, we may add,—

A man 's a man for a' that.

"God is the Eternal Spirit or self-consciousness subject, which communicates itself, in measure and under conditions, to beings who through that communication become spiritual" [p. 87]. "He is a Being in whom we exist; with whom we are in principle one; with whom the human spirit is identical in

the sense that He *is* all which the human spirit is capable of becoming." This is distinctly the Christian doctrine of God, the Creator, breathing into man the breath of mental and moral as well as of physical life. General readers will not care for a reproduction of the close, sustained, analytical, and philosophical arguments by which he reaches this pronounced theistic conception, and I would advise them to omit this *First Book*, which he himself characterises as likely to repel readers.

In *Book Second* he takes up the *Metaphysics of moral action* in the same method. "What are the conditions on the part of consciousness implied in the fact that there is such a thing as morality?"

We find our moral activity like our mental, conditioned by sensational elements, inextricably interwoven with physical instincts, animal impulses, wants, and desires. But an animal want is not the whole of man's moral motive. It runs into, or rather is taken up by, a self-conscious subject, making it a wanted object for self.

"It only becomes a motive, so far as upon the want there supervenes the presentation of the want by a self-conscious subject to himself, and with it the idea of a self-satisfaction to be attained in filling the want" [p. 93].

"It is this consciousness which yields, in the most elementary form, the conception of something that *should be*, as distinct from that *which is*" [p. 92].

He defines a motive to be "an idea of an end, which a self-conscious subject presents to itself, and which it strives and tends to realise," which he maintains is sufficient to differentiate moral action from natural, necessitated, physical activity. One can be said to be determined by his desires only so far as *he consciously makes them his objects*, or seeks his self-satisfaction in them. When, for example, Esau sells his birthright, an animal want conditions his motive, but the motive itself is his idea of himself as finding his good in the satisfaction of the animal want. Otherwise he would not be responsible. It is this identification of himself with the animal want, this making it his good, that constitutes it the strongest motive, and at the same time makes him responsible. He has said to himself, that will satisfy me, that is good, thereby constituting freely the strongest motive and determining himself. The good which one thus chooses is always comparative. This formal freedom

will not become real freedom till the ends or goods in which self-satisfaction is sought are such as can really satisfy the perfect man. The real nature of any act of will thus depends upon the nature of the object which one chooses as his good, and this choice depends upon the character of the chooser. All moral action thus is the realising of the good, better, best self within us. We thus mould circumstances, wants, and impulses. Esau chose *a good*, but not a better nor the best. All this seems implied in Green's exposition, though not explicitly stated. And this implies the privative or comparative view of sin—the choice of an inferior good.

This too must be taken in connection with his metaphysic of morality, which is that of an eternal self-conscious subject, which makes the processes of animal life and impulse organic to a reproduction of itself, which reproduction is qualified and limited by the nature of those processes, but which constitutes free self-conscious subjects—sons of GOD made in His own image.

Indeed, "alike as in GOD, as communicated in principle to men, and as realising itself by means of that communication in a certain development of human capacities, the idea can have its being only in a personal, *i. e.*, a self-objectifying, consciousness" [p. 203].

We resist the temptation to make at length some exposition and criticisms of all the implications of this essentially Scriptural conception of the relation of GOD and man in both good and evil human activity.

We pass over, too, the notable exposition of the synthesis of desire, intellect, and will in the moral ego. He surrenders no vital element held by the analytical psychologist, and yet refuses to consider man as a bundle of quasi-independent faculties. The whole man is in each, and each is in the other. They are simply the man thinking, desiring, and willing. The moral will is never thoughtless, nor desireless. It is not some distinct part of man, separable from intellect and desire, nor is it a mere combination of them. "The will is simply the man. Any act of the will is the expression of the man as he, at the time, is" [p. 158]. Throughout this part, too, there is a keen polemic against all forms of physical determinism. His view is essentially this, that the ultimate form of determinism is that of spirit by spirit. We work out our own salvation with fear and

trembling, thankfully conscious that it is GOD which worketh in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure. [*Philippians* ii. 12, 13.]

Thus far he has been securing the metaphysical or scientific basis of Ethics. On p. 189 an excellent *résumé* is given. His own views on specific ethical questions, which will be much more interesting to the general reader, are found in the *Third* and *Fourth Books*.

The distinction between the good and the bad will lies at the root of every system of Ethics. All willing is not moral. The form of all acts of will being the identification of the self with the idea of an object in which self-satisfaction is sought, the moral quality of the act depends upon the nature of this object. This object is never pleasure, nor a sum of pleasures, but that which satisfies desires, and so *moral good* is *that which will satisfy a moral being*, a good man. Even Mill concedes the qualitative difference between such objects. This intrinsic difference lies in the will, in the man as he is. When asked for a catalogue of such intrinsic goods, we answer that it is human perfection, the thoroughly good will to choose the highest good, to be perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect. What this good, this perfection in the definite contents of its fulness is, we cannot tell. But this idea of the Best has always been the spring in man's struggle after the Better. "Of this object (Best) it can never be possible for man to give a sufficient account of capabilities which can only be fully known in their ultimate realisation" [p. 203]. Even with the perfect man, CHRIST JESUS, as our example, we cannot define, in all details, a full scheme of duties. But this idea of perfection, being the moralising agent in human life, has been gradually realising itself in social, civil, and religious institutions and codes, which progressively and relatively define the ideal for the time, loyalty to which is essentially the good will of the individual. Such institutions are, so to speak, the form and body of reason as practical in men, as the categories of thought are of pure or speculative reason. This human perfection of life, too, can only be realised in some social organisation, social life being to personality what language is to thought. *Unus homo nullus homo*. Without society no persons. Isolation impoverishes and destroys the talent, society develops and enriches. Yet *personal worth* is the ultimate standard of worth. Progress of

humanity can only consist in the progress of personal character of its constituent persons. And no state of humanity, here or hereafter, can be such a kingdom of righteousness, in which such persons can be extinguished or pass away. Thus he insists on the eternal life of righteous persons [p. 199]. This ideal is only completely realised in God. "Of these implications one is the *eternal realisation* for, or in, the eternal mind, of the capacities gradually realised in time" [p. 196] by humanity. It comes into the individual somewhat indefinite and unfilled, as a communication in germ or principle, and as such has been the dynamic of the moralisation of man and humanity. It commands imperatively. Man cannot give a sufficient account of it, because it consists in the realisation of capabilities which can only be fully known and codified in their ultimate realisation. And yet it has no lack of definite content, for this good will has been continuously creating for itself "a filling or content, in the shape of arts, laws, institutions, and habits of living, which, as far as they go, exhibit the capabilities of man, define the idea of his end, and afford a positive answer to the otherwise unanswerable question, What in particular is it, that man has it in him to become" [p. 391]. He speaks more definitely of what this realised conception now is farther on. Its "determination has reached that stage in which the educated citizen of Christendom is able to think of the perfect life as essentially conditioned by the exercise of virtues, resting on a self-sacrificing will, in which it is open to all men to participate, and as fully attainable by one man, only so far as through those virtues it is attained by all. In thinking of ultimate good, he thinks of it indeed necessarily as perfection for himself, as a life in which he shall be fully satisfied through having become all the Spirit within him enables him to become. But he cannot think of himself as satisfied in any other life than a social life, exhibiting the exercise of self-denying, and in which the multitude of the redeemed, which is all men, participate" [p. 414]. This is but a severely restrained ethical restatement of S. Paul's vision of our all coming into a perfect man in CHRIST. [*Ephesians* ii. 13.]*

As for the individual, obedience to the ideal as far as thus

* It is well to add here that Green completes the subjective view of ethics of this volume by the objective view in his *Politics*, found in his *Collected Works*, vol. ii.

expressed is categorically imperative. Though conventional morality is an incomplete expression of the ideal, its requirements upon the individual are liable to no exception, *at least for the individual's pleasure*, and only for a higher expression of itself in new duties.

Thus the *content* of the categorical imperative (for us the highest view of Christian conduct) turns out to be rather too great than too little and indefinite. Later on, in *Book Fourth*, he considers at length the exceptions to this conformity to the current code of morality that arise from conscientiousness, and from the impulse that forces men to become reformers.

In treating of the origin and development of the *Moral Ideal*, he shows (a) that reason is the source of the idea of common good. Out of the lowest animal wants, it may be "out of the processes common to man's life with the life of animals, there arise for man, as they do not apparently arise for animals, —

Relations dear and all the charities
Of father, son, and brother."

Hence no amount of biological, zoological, and barbarian antecedents that may be discovered can be pointed to as the efficient antecedents of human morality. Only the immanent operation of ideas of reason in any conduct can account for the formation of even the lowest form of a code of morality.

The lowest form is further developed through reason by (b) the "extension of the area of common good," by the gradual broadening of the answer to the question, *Who is my neighbor?* At first every stranger was an enemy, to-day all men are neighbors. But the enlargement is also qualitative (c), a gradual determination by the deepening and purifying of the idea of good. In an uncivilised state, this good may be chiefly material well-being, food, drink, and warmth, — the necessities of physical life for one's family or clan. This may have been the moral conception of our own ancestors. But there, also, duty to the ideal was present. Whenever life has been so organised as to afford relief from this chief and most pressing duty, there has been a progress to living well, τὸ εὖ ζῆν from τὸ ζῆν. Aristotle recognised external goods, goods of the body and goods of the soul. Kant finally purified and determined *the good* as the *good will*, the will to be and do good, to be perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect.

The author points out more in detail this gradual spiritualisation or dematerialisation of the idea of good, until it reaches the Christian ideal of a community of saints or holy wills. He shows its growth and attainment among the Greeks, and points out the continuity of their moral categories in Christian ethics. This is the finest and most interesting chapter in the volume, and deserves the fuller exposition that can only be given in another article. Wisdom, manliness, temperance, and justice were the categories which Aristotle found in the ethical conception of the Greeks. We need and use those forms yet. They help us to express more definitely the Christian idea of perfection. They mean very much more to us since CHRIST came, and the Christian life has been organised. He then shows the progress in the continuity of Christian with Greek conceptions by a detailed examination and comparison of their conceptions of the duties of *Fortitude* and *Temperance*. The Greek conception of the cardinal virtues was conditioned by the moral progress then achieved, and was necessarily inadequate. The Christian idea of human brotherhood leads to social requirements then unrecognised. Yet they provided the forms and moulds, the intellectual medium by means of which Christian enthusiasm could definitely conceive goodness as realised in the members of a universal society. "When a person had appeared, charging himself with the work of establishing a kingdom of GOD among men, announcing purity of heart as the sole condition of membership of that kingdom, then the time came for the value of the philosophers' work to appear. When a new society, all-embracing in idea and aspiration, was forming itself on the basis of the common vocation, 'Be ye therefore perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect,' there was need of definite conceptions as to the modes of virtuous living in which that vocation was to be fulfilled" [p. 307].

In *Book Fourth* he considers "the application of moral philosophy to the guidance of conduct."

Can it help to answer the questions, *What ought I to do*, and *What ought I to be*, if *the will to be good* is the chief good?

The habit of such inquiry is *conscientiousness*. Admitting that a man may finger his motives too much, and be over-conscientious, it remains true that the comparison of our actions and motives with an ideal of goodness is the spring from which morality perpetually renews its life. This comparison only

humbles that it may exalt us. It is this which rouses men from dead conformity to current codes, and justifies a departure from them. It is itself the categorical imperative calling man up to a higher conception of its own content. And there is a real identity between such searchings of heart and the reformer's comparison of what is actual with a social ideal, for he identifies himself with this ideal, makes it his ideal, and feels a personal responsibility for realising it. Reformers are protesting idealists, "men who have refused to accept the way of living which they found about them, to which, upon the principle of seeking the greatest pleasure and avoiding the greater pain, they would naturally have conformed" [p. 324].

The theory of a moral ideal is of some value, too, in solving a *bonâ fide* perplexity of conscience. But "the margin within which perplexities can arise in a Christian society is not really very large. The effort after an ideal of conduct has so far taken effect in the establishment of a recognised standard of what is due from man to man, that the articulation of the general imperative, 'Do what is best for mankind,' into particular duties is sufficiently clear and full for the ordinary occasions of life, and in fulfilling them loyally, and without shirking, we can seldom go wrong. But the function of bringing home these duties to the consciences of men, . . . is rather that of the preacher than of the philosopher" [p. 341]. But real cases of practical perplexity do arise. They must, however, be distinguished from those self-sophistications which arise from a desire to find excuses for gratifying unworthy inclinations. Kant settles all such false cases of conscience by the drastic rule that *Achtung* for the moral law is also *Verachtung* for one's selfish inclinations. In cases like that of Jeanie Deans, in the *Heart of Mid-Lothian*, Professor Green quite agrees with Janet, that "there is a point where all theory fails, and science has no more formulas to offer" [Janet's *Theory of Morals*, p. 291], only maintaining that a true moral theory aids in the formation of that chronic good will or character which must decide intuitively in such cases.

But in cases of perplexity that arise from the conflict of apparently equal authorities that have claim upon our obedience, as State and Church, moral philosophy can be of much use. It prepares us for this by giving us a just estimate of all external authorities, showing us that, though they are all products of the idea of unconditional good, they yet only partially express it.

In the last two chapters of the volume, Professor Green compares the practical value of the hedonistic and utilitarian theories with his own theory of *the good as human perfection*. One who has read thus far in the volume does not need to be assured that he accords them a most generous, because a most conscientious treatment. His most trenchant criticism in the whole volume is upon the Universalistic Hedonism of Professor Sidgwick.

In reply, Professor Sidgwick, in his polemically critical review of the volume, to which we have already referred, says that Green "never wrote for victory, . . . in the candid, earnest, careful, exhaustive style of controversy which was peculiarly his own." [*Mind*, No. XXXIV., p. 187.]

This conscientious spirit is a chief characteristic of the volume. Sometimes it seems almost to be over-conscientious when examining totally diverse theories. This, too, accounts for the somewhat slight and reserved contention for Christian ethics as ultimate and absolute. But this conscientiousness is as distinctively Christian, as it is most evidently based upon the Christian theistic conception. It is because of his most strenuous contention throughout for the theistic basis and metaphysic of ethics, that we have entitled this too brief and imperfect review of his volume *Theistic Ethics*.

J. MACBRIDE STERRETT.

LIFE, TIMES, AND CORRESPONDENCE OF BISHOP WHITE.

CHAPTER VI. — THE MEETING IN NEW YORK, OCTOBER, 1784.

IN October, 1784, there assembled in the city of New York the first General Convention of clergy and laity from the various States where the Church still possessed life enough to warrant the choice of delegates, and where the adherents of our faith cared to instruct them as to the measures intended for the organisation and perpetuation of the Church in America. The meeting took place on the sixth and seventh days of October, and was probably held in S. Paul's Church, — Trinity being still in ruins. The proceedings of this preliminary meeting were issued from the press on a folio "broadside," now of great rarity, and of which Bishop White, a half century since, wrote that it "was in very few hands at the time, and is probably at this time generally destroyed and lost."* The Bishop White Papers in the archives of the General Convention contain a copy of this broadside, with additional particulars, endorsed by the Bishop "as in y^e Hand writing of Dr. William Smith who presided." From these records and the allusions to the proceedings found in the correspondence of the period, we propose to draw our account of a gathering second to none ever assembled in public in this country in importance and in far-reaching influences for good.

At the head of the list of delegates appears the name of the Rev. Samuel Parker, A. M., as representing "Massachusetts and Rhode Island." Born of a noted family in New Hampshire, the son of the Hon. William Parker, Judge of the Superior Court of that State, and graduated at Harvard College, in Cambridge, in 1764, Mr. Parker's name closes the list preserved in the archives at Fulham, of "Persons Licensed to the Plantations by the Bishops of London" under the head of "New England,"†

* *Memoirs of the Church*, second edition, p. 80.

† *Prot. Epis. Hist. Soc. Coll.* vol. i. p. 115.

and the date "February 28, 1774" is indicative of the occasion of the absence of further entries of applicants from America. He had entered upon his duties as Assistant Minister of Trinity Church, Boston, in November of the year of his ordination, and only a few months had elapsed when amidst the opening scenes of the War of the Revolution he had to decide between the conflicting claims of the Church to which he had sworn allegiance at ordination on the one hand, and those of his native land on the other. On the retirement of the rector of Trinity, Dr. William Walter, and other clergymen of the Church, to Nova Scotia with the great body of Boston refugees, Mr. Parker, whose sympathies had been from the first with the opponents of the Crown, remained at his post and continued in the faithful discharge of his ministerial duties. On consultation with his Vestry he discontinued, shortly after the Declaration of Independence, the use of the "State prayers" in the daily offices; and after faithful and acceptable service during the ensuing month, and as soon as the question of a vacancy in the rectorship was decided, Mr. Parker was unanimously chosen to fill the vacant post. At the close of the war he devoted himself to the care of the few remaining missions and parishes of the Church in Massachusetts, and was among the foremost in plans and efforts for the revival and perpetuation of the Church at large. It is to his wise counsels and judicious measures that the final union of the Churches of New England, and those of the Middle and Southern States, was largely due. The Church in America has reason to be grateful to God for the life and labors of Samuel Parker, second Bishop of Massachusetts.

Following the name of Parker in the "broadside" list of delegates is that of the Rev. John Rutgers Marshall, A. M., of Connecticut. One of the fourteen clergymen left in Connecticut at the close of the war, — one of the ten who made choice of Seabury to go abroad for the Episcopate on that memorable Lady-day, 1783, — the minister of the parish at Woodbury, and the occupant of the house where this event took place, Mr. Marshall brought to the meeting in New York the official and carefully prepared response of the Connecticut clergy to the invitation extended to them to attend. Mr. Marshall was a native of New York city, the son of Dutch Reformed parents, and a graduate of King's, now Columbia, College. His studies in divinity had been directed by the Rev. Dr. Samuel Johnson, the President of

King's, and after his ordination and appointment to Connecticut, he had ministered faithfully at his post during the war, though subjected to great obloquy and even personal abuse. It does not appear that Mr. Marshall entered into the debates or proceedings of the New York Convention any further than to present his instructions, and thus to convey to the assembly the determination of the Connecticut clergy to await the coming of their Bishop ere proceeding further in the work of Church organisation.

The name of Samuel Provoost, A. M., stands at the head of the list of delegates appointed from New York. Of Huguenot descent, a graduate of King's, and subsequently a student at S. Peter's College, Cambridge, England, he had served for a time as an assistant at Trinity, New York, but his ministrations were deemed lacking in evangelical fervor, and his sympathies in political matters ran counter to those of the great body of his hearers. Retiring to a small place in Dutchess County, adjacent to the estate of his friends, the Livingstons, who had been fellow-students with him at the University of Cambridge, he spent the years of the war in study, officiating occasionally in the neighboring churches, and on one occasion taking up arms in the service of his country. Unanimously chosen to the rectorship of Trinity on the evacuation of this city by the British forces and the loyalists, Mr. Provoost resumed the exercise of his profession, and became at once, from his position and political preferences, a leading man in Church and State. In the deputation from New York appointed to attend this Convention for Church reorganisation, his name is associated with that of the Rev. Abraham Beach, A. M., whose influence in bringing about this meeting we have already noticed, and who had, subsequent to the measures he had taken to secure its success, been called to an assistantcy of Trinity Church. The Rev. Benjamin Moore, A. M., subsequently second Bishop of New York; the Rev. Joshua Bloomer, A. M., who had left business and the profession of arms for the Church; the Rev. Leonard Cutting, A. M., a graduate of Pembroke College, Cambridge, England, who after most romantic experiences, — coming to New York as a "redemptioneer," and spending some time in manual labor, — had become a tutor and professor at King's; and had entered successfully into the sacred ministry; and the Rev. Thomas Moore of Long Island, who alone lacked a college degree, made up the

clerical deputation from New York. With these gentlemen were associated the well known Hon. James Duane, and Marinus Willet, and John Alsop, Esquires, all citizens of New York of standing and repute. New Jersey sent the factious Rev. Uzal Ogden, whose struggle for the Episcopate will come under review at a later period of our story. With him came John De Hart, and John Chetwood, Esquires, with Mr. Samuel Spragg, who was shortly afterwards to take orders and render good service to the Church. Besides William White, D. D., Pennsylvania sent the Rev. Dr. Samuel Magaw, Vice-Provost of the University of Pennsylvania, and the Rev. Joseph Hutchins, A. M., of Lancaster, whose names we shall meet again and again. With these gentlemen were associated Matthew Clarkson, Richard Willing, Samuel Powel, and Richard Peters, Esquires, all men of prominence in Church and State. From Delaware came the Rev. Sydenham Thorne, of whom little is known; the Rev. Charles Henry Wharton, a man of singular elegance and accomplishments, a scion of an old Maryland family of the Romish faith, who had renounced Romanism for the Catholicity of the Church in which he was to bear an honored name, deserved by learning, purity, and a holy life; and Mr. Robert Clay, then a man of business, but a few years later ordained by Bishop White. Maryland was represented by the celebrated Dr. William Smith, who had been recommended by the Clergy for the Episcopate. At the foot of the "broadside" proceedings appears the following *Nota Bene*. "The Rev. Mr. Griffith from the State of Virginia was present by permission. The Clergy of that State, being restricted by Laws yet in force there, were not at liberty to send Delegates, or consent to any Alterations in the Order, Government, Doctrine, or Worship of the Church." Such was the *personnel* of the Convention assembling in New York, in October, 1784, to consult and act respecting the future of the American Church. It was a "voluntary" assembly, Bishop White is at pains to inform us,* "not an authorised convention, because there were no authorities from the Churches in the several States, even in the appointments of the members, which were made from the congregations, to which they respectively belonged; except of Mr. Parker, from Massachusetts, of Mr. Marshall, from Connecticut, and of those who attended from Pennsylvania: even from these States, there was no further

* *Memoirs of the Church*, second edition, p. 80.

authority, than to deliberate and propose." "Accordingly," the Bishop proceeds, "the acts of the body were in the form of recommendation and proposal." The organisation was effected by the choice of the Rev. Dr. Smith "as President of the Convention" and the appointment of the Rev. Benjamin Moore as Secretary. The MS. proceedings give the following record of the action directly following the formal organisation: "The Letters of Appointments and other Documents produced by the several Members above mentioned were read; and also the following letters from the Clergy of Massachusetts Bay and Connecticut." * These letters are not appended to the record, but we give them from other sources. The Massachusetts letters were prefaced by one from the Rev. Samuel Parker which had accompanied the official correspondence as originally sent to Dr. White and which is still preserved among his correspondence. We give Mr. Parker's communication, as it would appear that it was read with the other Massachusetts papers at the meeting:—

REV^d SIR,—I have the honour to enclose you an Extract of the Proceedings of a Convention of the Episcopal clergy of the States of Massachusetts and Rhode Island held at Boston the 8th Instant and also a Letter from said Convention to the Com^{tee} of the churches in your State, both which I hope you will safely receive. The Perusal of these will fully inform you of the Sentiments of the clergy in these States and will preclude the Necessity of my enlarging on these points. You will perceive that they have adopted your plan with a small Addition to your first Article without which, as I mentioned to you in my Letter by Mr. Morris, I supposed the article would be objected to. In my private opinion I do not see that the Limitation was at all necessary because I do not apprehend the Independency there intended would in the least be affected by an application to a foreign Power for the Succession of Episcopal Authority. The Churches here being most of them without a minister, a representative body chosen by the several Churches would consist almost entirely of Laymen, and if they are vested with the Power of making Laws it will be in their power to subject the Clergy to what Laws they please, and for that reason the Convention thought best to add a Clause to your fifth Article to put the Clergy and Laity more upon a par, and they have accordingly proposed and adopted this mode of Representation, that each Church chuse one lay Delegate in conjunction with their Minister and that those Churches that are destitute of a Clergyman sh^d chuse one of the neigh-

* Perry's *Historical Notes and Documents*, p. 5.

bouring Ministers to represent them, with one of their own Laymen, and in this mode they think there is no great danger of their having too much Power. I have yet heard nothing more of the Meeting of the Churches by their Committees at New York than what you mention in yours by the Rev^d Mr. Clark, and therefore shall not proceed thither agreeable to the Request of our Convention unless I can learn that such a meeting will certainly be held. I have flattered myself with the hopes that you would before this have favoured me with further Information upon that as well as some other matters. The Plan of Correspondence agreed on between your Brethren in New York and New Jersey mentioned in yours of May 30 has not taken effect as we have in these parts had not the least Intelligence from that Quarter. Should any general meeting of the Churches be proposed, we shall be obliged to you for Notice thereof as we are perfectly disposed to adopt any measures calculated to promote the Welfare of our Church.

I am requested by the Com^{tee} of our Convention to ask the favour of you to transmit an account of our proceedings to the more southern Churches and also would acquaint you and them that we shall be happy to receive any Communications you or they shall be pleased to favour us with. We wish also for your Opinion whether it is probable Congress will interfere in any matter of an Ecclesiastical Nature and whether they would countenance a Request made to England for a Bishop.

Wishing you all possible happiness I remain

Rev^d Sir with the utmost Respect and Esteem
your Brother and very hum^{ble} Serv^t

SAM^l PARKER.

BOSTON, Sept^r 10, 1784.

Rev^d Dr WHITE.

At a Meeting of the Episcopal Clergy of the State of Massachusetts and Rhode Island held at Boston Sept^r 8 1784

Voted That the Episcopal Church in the united States of America is and ought to be independent of all foreign Authority ecclesiastical and civil. But it is the Opinion of this Convention that this Independence be not construed or taken in so rigorous a Sense as to exclude the Churches in America separately or collectively from applying for and obtaining from some regular Episcopal foreign Power an American Episcopate.

Secondly That the Episcopal Church in these States hath and ought to have in common with all other religious Societies full and exclusive Powers to regulate the Concerns of its own Communion.

Thirdly That the Doctrines of the Gospel be maintained as now professed by the Church of England and Uniformity of Worship be continued as near as may be to the Liturgy of said Church.

Fourthly That the Succession of the Ministry be agreeable to the Usage which requireth the three Orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, that the rights and Powers of the same be respectively ascertained and that they be exercised according to reasonable Laws to be duly made.

Fifthly That the Power of making Canons and Laws be vested solely in a representative Body of the Clergy and Laity conjointly ; in which Body the Laity ought not to exceed or their Votes to be more in Number than those of the Clergy.

Sixthly That no Powers be delegated to a general ecclesiastical Government except such as cannot conveniently be exercised by the Clergy and Vestries in their respective Congregations.

Voted That the Rev^d Mr Parker, Rev^d Mr Bass and Rev^d Mr Fisher be a Com^{tee} on behalf of the Churches in these States to correspond and consult with the Clergy of the other Episcopal Churches in America in Convention Committees or other ways.

Voted That a circular Letter be written in the Name of this Convention to the Episcopal Clergy in the States of Connecticut New York and Pennsylvania urging the Necessity of their uniting with us in adopting some speedy Measures to procure an American Episcopate. As it is the unanimous Opinion of this Convention that this is the primary object they ought to have in view, because the very Existence of the Church requires some speedy Mode of obtaining regular Ordination.

Voted That in case a general Meeting of the Episcopal Churches in the united States by their Representatives is now or shall at any future time before the next Meeting of the Convention be proposed by any number of Churches to be held for the purpose of promoting the Welfare of said Church, the Rev^d Mr Parker be desired to meet and act with said representative body on behalf of this Convention.

Voted That the Convention or Committees of Churches in the States of Connecticut, New York and Pennsylvania be informed of the Proceedings of this Convention and that they or some of them be requested to transmit the same to our more southern Brethren.

A true Extract from the Minutes.

Attest

REVEREND & HONOURED BRETHREN, — Having been favored with the Minutes of the meeting of the Clergy and Lay Delegates from sundry Congregations of the Episcopal Church in the State of Pennsylvania held at Philadelphia the 25th of May last communicated to us by your Chairman, We the Clergy of the Episcopal Churches in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and State of Rhode Island met in Convention at Boston, Septem^r 8th 1784 have duly considered the

same and have unanimously adopted the fundamental Principles or Instructions to which you are bound and think the same not only unexceptionable but such as the Episcopal Churches in the united States ought to adopt. We have indeed thought proper to add a Restriction or rather an explanatory Clause to the first and fifth Article more for the Sake of avoiding any Mistakes hereafter than because we suppose we differ from you in Sentiment.

But it is our unanimous Opinion that it is beginning at the wrong end to attempt to organize our Church before we have obtained a head. Our Churches at present resemble the scattered Limbs of the body without any common Centre of union or Principle to animate the whole. We cannot conceive it probable or even possible to carry the plan you have pointed out into Execution before an Episcopate is obtained to direct our Motions, and by a delegated Authority to claim our assent.

It is needless to represent to you the absolute Necessity of adopting and uniting in some speedy measure to procure some reputable Person who is regularly invested with the powers of Ordination &c to reside among us, without which scarce the Shadow of an Episcopal Church will soon remain in these States. Many are the Congregations here destitute of a Clergyman, and we must be left to the disagreeable Alternative of having no Church in many of our Settlements where there would probably be a respectable one, or of having clerical Powers conveyed in an irregular manner.

As to the mode of obtaining what we stand in such need of, we wish above all things to procure it in the most regular manner and particularly from our mother Church in England. Whether any of the Churches in England or Ireland would consecrate a Person chosen among ourselves and sent there for that purpose without a Mandate from the King of England or the Authority of his Parliament, we are at a loss to determine ; but we have no doubt that a regular Application made by a representative Body of the Episcopal Churches in America would easily obtain a consecrated head, and in order to this we earnestly wish a mode of applying in some such way be immediately adopted by the American Churches.

We are of opinion that we ought to leave no means untried to procure a regular succession of the Episcopacy before we think of obtaining it in an irregular manner. To accomplish this we have chosen a Committee of our Body to correspond with you upon this Subject and to adopt such Measures for the same as may be expedient or necessary. And in case a meeting of a representative Body shall be agreed upon, we have delegated a Power to one of our Number to represent us and our Churches in such a Meeting. We are extremely anxious for the Preservation of our Communion and the Continuance of an

Uniformity of Doctrine and Worship, but we see not how this can be maintained without a common head, and are therefore desirous of uniting with you in such measures as shall be found expedient and proper for the common good.

We are Gentlemen your affectionate Brethren and Friends.

Signed in behalf of said Convention

J. GRAVES, *Modr.*

BOSTON, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, *Septemr. 8th*, 1784.

The Committee of the Episcopal Churches in the State of Pennsylvania.

The letter from the clergy of Connecticut was as follows :—

NEW HAVEN, *September 2*, 1784.

GENTLEMEN, — We hereby acknowledge your invitation of the clergy of Connecticut to meet you in Convention, appointed to be held at New York on the 5th of October. The intention of this invitation we understand, from the report of your Committee, and what we see done in a meeting at Philadelphia, May 25th, was to collect as extensively as at present is practicable, the voice of the professors of the Church, in order to frame an ecclesiastical constitution, a form of public worship, and a regimen of government.

While we ardently desire that the strictest uniformity may obtain in the American Church, we shall be equally solicitous to do everything in our power, in conjunction with our brethren in the other States, to promote that important end and to lay a permanent foundation on which to continue and perpetuate in her, unity of spirit in the bond of peace.

But to proceed with propriety in affairs of the above nature, and of such momentous consideration, we observe, that in our opinion, the first regular step is, to have the American Church completed in her officers; prior to that we conceive all our proceedings will be unprecedented and unsanctioned by any authoritative example in the Christian Church.

To avoid what we judge a procedure that no Episcopalian would willingly adopt, but under circumstances that, with him, decide the necessity of it, we have taken our measures to obtain for Connecticut the principal officer in our Church, whose arrival among us, we flatter ourselves with the certainty of, and that the time is not very far distant. Whenever this event hath taken place, we shall, being prompted by sentiments of duty as well as by inclination, we shall be forward to meet our brethren of the other States, and, with our bishop, deliberate upon every subject needful and salutary to our Church. We would wish to be considered as having warmly at heart the unity and prosperity of the Episcopal Church in America, and that all things may be done decently and in order, for the accomplishment of that most

interesting object. We shall accordingly esteem it as a mark of brotherly attention, and what will afford us a high satisfaction, if our brethren, in the united Convention at New York should concur with us on this occasion, and agree to suspend the entering upon these general points, until we can properly meet them upon an affair of so great moment and joint concern to them, to ourselves, and the whole American Church.

The Rev. Mr. Marshall, at our request, will deliver this, and represent us in your Convention.

We are, with respect, your brethren and humble servants,

The Clergy of Connecticut.

Signed by order,

ABRAHAM JARVIS, *Secretary.**

To the principles enunciated in these communications from the Churchmen of Connecticut and Massachusetts and Rhode Island, the New England clergy and laity clung with pertinacious consistency. The Massachusetts letter, though signed by the Moderator, the Rev. J. Graves, is in the handwriting of Parker, and was evidently his composition. It was in accordance with the feeling that it was beginning at the wrong end to attempt to organise the Church before it had obtained a head; and in fulfilment of the expressed conviction that "a regular application" from a "representative body of the Episcopal Churches in America would easily obtain a consecrated head," that the measures subsequently taken in Massachusetts under the lead of Parker brought about at length the union of the Churches on a Churchly basis and in deference to Episcopal precedent and authority.

That these counsels failed to commend themselves to the members of the Convention of 1785 cannot excite surprise. The reading of the letters from the New England churches was followed directly, we infer from the minutes made by the President, Dr. William Smith, by the appointment of a committee of Clerical and Lay Deputies "to essay the fundamental Principles of a general Constitution." Of this Committee the Rev. Drs. Smith and White, and the Rev. Messrs. Parker and Provoost, with Messrs. Clarkson, De Hart, Clay, and Duane, were members. The same Committee was "desired to frame and propose to the Convention a proper substitute for the State Prayers in the Liturgy to be used for the sake of Uniformity

* Beardsley's *Life and Correspondence of Bishop Seabury*, pp. 196, 197.

till a further Review shall be undertaken by general authority and consent of the Church."

On the following day, October 7, the attendance being the same as on the day before, the Committee presented their report. It is to be found in full in the preface to Bioren's reprint of the Convention Journals, edited by Bishop White; in the re-issue of the early journals which has appeared under the sanction of the General Convention; and in the various editions of White's *Memoirs of the Church*.* It lays down the "funda-

* The record of this day's proceedings as found in Dr. Smith's annotated minutes is as follows:—

Oct. 7th. Present as above.

The Committee appointed yesterday to essay the fundamental Principles of an ecclesiastical Constitution for this Church, reported an Essay for this Purpose, which being read and duly considered and amended, was adopted as follows, viz:—

The Body now assembled, recommend to the Clergy and Congregations of their Communion in the States represented as above, and propose to those of the other States not represented, That as soon as they shall have organised or associated themselves in the States to which they respectively belong, agreeably to such Rules as they shall think proper, they unite in a general ecclesiastical Constitution, on the following fundamental Principles.

I. That there shall be a general Convention of the Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

II. That the Episcopal Church in each State, send Deputies to the Convention, consisting of Clergy and Laity.

III. That associated Congregations in two or more States, may send Deputies jointly.

IV. That the said Church shall maintain the Doctrines of the Gospel as now held by the Church of England, and shall adhere to the Liturgy of the said Church as far as shall be consistent with the American Revolution, and the Constitutions of the respective States.

V. That in every State where there shall be a Bishop duly consecrated and settled, he shall be considered as a Member of the Convention, ex Officio.

VI. That the Clergy and Laity assembled in Convention, shall deliberate in one Body, but shall vote separately; and the Concurrence of both shall be necessary to give Validity to every Measure.

VII. That the first Meeting of the Convention shall be at *Philadelphia*, the Tuesday before the Feast of S. Michael next; to which it is hoped, and earnestly desired, That the Episcopal Churches in the respective States, will send their Clerical and Lay Deputies, duly instructed and authorised to proceed on the necessary Business herein proposed for their Deliberation.

Signed by Order of the Convention,

WILLIAM SMITH, D. D., *President.*

Resolved that it be recommended to the Clergy in the respective Churches here represented to appoint in each State a Committee of not less than two Clergymen to examine Persons who in the present Exigency are desirous of officiating as Readers, and to direct them to such Duties as they are to perform; and that it be recommended to the Congregations not to suffer any Lay Persons to officiate in their Churches other than such as shall be certified by said Committee to be duly qualified.

WM. SMITH, *President.*

mental principles" of a general ecclesiastical constitution; it establishes a general convention of the Episcopal Church in the United States of America; it defines the character of its members to be sent by the Episcopal Church in each State, who are to be both clerical and lay; it gives power for associated action on the part of "Congregations in two or more States to send deputies jointly;" it declares the maintenance of the "doctrines of the Gospel now held by the Church of England," by the Church in America, and asserts its purpose of adherence to the "Liturgy of the said Church as far as shall be consistent with the American Revolution and the Constitutions of the respective States;" it gives to "a bishop duly consecrated and settled" in any State, *ex officio* membership of the convention; it provides for the equality for the clerical and lay vote, requiring concurrence to secure the passage of any measure; and it appoints the first meeting of the General Convention thus established and defined "at Philadelphia, the Tuesday before the Feast of S. Michael next," expressing the hope that the "Episcopal Churches in the respective States will send their clerical and lay deputies, duly instructed and authorised to proceed in the necessary business herein proposed for their deliberations." Other evidence than the printed records afford leads us to believe that this "essay," as originally presented, was considerably pruned and amended when under deliberation in the "Committee of the Whole." As appears from allusions to the subject in the correspondence between White and Parker, the fifth article, as originally reported, provided for the *presidency* of a bishop, should one be obtained before the meeting of the convention, reference evidently being had to the probable success of Seabury in his mission abroad; but this very proper measure, though supported by the New England delegations, and by Dr. White himself, was voted down, a fact we can only explain by the subsequent course taken by Provoost towards Seabury, who was personally and politically distasteful to the New York divine. The proposition for the change of the State prayers, referred to this committee, appears to have been met by a general declaration of adherence to the English Prayer Book. This appears to have been the work of Parker, who complained bitterly when the Philadelphia convention, a little later, proceeded ruthlessly, and, as he justly remarked, without any authority, to the complete and thorough revision of the liturgy.

The admission of the laity to the councils of the Church — White's favorite scheme — was secured, although in Connecticut the bishop-elect had received only clerical votes, and the same was true in the case of Dr. Smith, the bishop-elect of Maryland. It was a wise and statesman-like measure, as time has since proved ; and for its acceptance White could well afford to sacrifice other and less important propositions. Beyond the adoption of these fundamental principles and suggestions, nothing was done, except the passage of a recommendation to the clergy of the respective States to authorise a committee to examine and appoint lay readers for "the present exigency." With this resolution this preliminary convention adjourned.

Bishop White's own summing up of the results of this meeting is given in his *Memoirs of the Church*. It is as follows :—

It seemed a great matter gained, to lay what promised to be a foundation for the continuing of the Episcopal Church, in the leading points of her doctrine, discipline, and worship : yet with such an accommodation to local circumstances, as might be expected to secure the concurrence of the great body of her members ; and without any exterior opposition to threaten the oversetting of the scheme.

At the present day, it may seem to have been of little consequence, to gain so considerable an assent, to what was determined at this meeting. But at the time in question, when the crisis presented a subject of deliberation entirely new, it was difficult to detach it in the minds of many, from a past habitual train of thinking. Some were startled at the very circumstance, of taking the stand of an independent Church. There was a much more common prejudice against the embracing the laity in a scheme of ecclesiastical legislation. Besides these things, the confessed necessity of accommodating the service to the newly established civil constitution of the country, naturally awakened apprehensions of unlimited license. Hence the restriction to the English liturgy, except in accommodation to the revolution, which restriction was not acquiesced in, as will be seen.*

Important as were the deliberations of this little body of Churchmen, the conclusions and results attained were received with widely opposite feelings at the North and South. The attitude of the New England representatives must have convinced the most obtuse that laxity in doctrine or indifference as to the polity of the Church would be a bar to united action at the present or consolidation in the time to come. And yet the direct

* Second edition, p. 81.

and almost immediate result of the measures adopted in New York was the loss to the Church of the King's Chapel in Boston, the present occupants of which had been seeking for their Socinian lay-reader, recognition and the promise of ordination when bishops were obtained. Provoost had been invited to the charge of this congregation in consequence of his supposed latitudinarianism. He had declined the invitation, and the requests made a little later to Seabury and himself for the ordination of Mr. James Freeman were refused. The revision of the liturgy by a Committee of the Congregation was followed by the public avowal of Arianism, and the first Episcopal Church of Boston became the first Unitarian society in New England, wholly alienated from the faith and possession of its founders and actual proprietors. We shall have occasion to refer again to this "unjustifiable transaction," as Bishop White does not hesitate to style it, — this "wresting of a place of worship from the Episcopal Church." *

There were other results attending this gathering in New York which must have given rise to no little anxiety and apprehension in the mind of White. The conduct of the President during the session had been such as to awaken grave doubts in the mind of the upright Wharton as to the fitness of Smith for the Episcopate of Maryland, to which he had been recommended by the clergy more than a year before, and it was the testimony borne by him to the doctor's habits while at the meeting in New York which a little later induced the best men in Maryland to withdraw their names from Smith's testimonial, and led the convention to defer for some years any attempt to secure a bishop. The evident laxity of Provoost in all matters of doctrine and discipline must have been distasteful to White, and doubtless prepared him for the subsequent prejudice towards Seabury which Provoost was at no pains to conceal, and which was alone brought under control and prevented from breaking into an open rupture by the firmness and fairness of White himself. Great and far-reaching as were the results of this convention, there was evident need of that wise adjustment and careful management of conflicting and well-nigh irreconcilable factions, which only the patience and prudence of one so singularly gifted with these virtues as was William White could, under God, have brought into harmony and true accord. The

* *Vide* Dr. Wilson's *Life of Bishop White*, Appendix, p. 323.

members separated to their respective homes on the adjournment, or, as was the case with Parker, who appears to have been greatly impressed by his intercourse with White, lingered on their journey at Philadelphia, where the leading spirits of the American Church who had the Church's good in view and were devoid of personal ambitions or partisan prejudices found in the rector of the united parishes of Christ Church and S. Peter's their leader and adviser.

On Dr. White's return to his native city he applied himself at once to the accomplishment of a plan he had earlier sought to promote, the founding of the "Episcopal Academy." That the design of this important institution "originated" with Dr. White we have the Bishop's explicit statement. He had prior to his journey to New York offered the headship of the proposed academy to the scholarly and accomplished Wharton in the interesting and able letter which follows, and shortly after his return from the convention received the reply which we append.

DEAR SIR :— Since we parted I am become a notorious speculator, and your literary talents are part of the commodities in which I wish to deal. The shameful state of education in this city has induced many gentlemen to desire to see an academy opened under the patronage of Christ Church and S. Peter's, and I have so far made use of your name, as to mention you as the most suitable gentleman of my acquaintance to fill the first place in it. I am so fully persuaded it is in your power to have it in your offer, that I cannot but wish you may so far open yourself to me (under such terms of secrecy as you may choose to enjoin) as to satisfy me whether you would accept the place provided it were made as respectable, in regard to salary, as the nature of such a station will admit. My idea is, that it should always be filled by a clergyman of our Church ; chiefly, because I have in contemplation a plan by which our vestry might forward the design by allowing him a compensation for assisting their clergy in the Sunday duty, leaving him totally disengaged from the parochial.

Two objects should be proposed in the intended Academy, to fit youth in general for business, and to lay the foundation of a collegiate education, for those who intend to take it, so that a year or two at the University may suffice.

Among many projects that occur to me on this subject I submit to you the following outlines for your opinion. Suppose three schools for English, Mathematics, and the Latin and Greek languages. Although I am convinced of your abilities for either, I wish to see you

in the last, for two reasons ; first, because I wish to see (what has never been attempted here) a classical taste for the English tongue, accompanying the knowledge of the Latin ; for which purpose the eldest classes in this school should attend to rhetoric, together with the higher classes — suppose Cicero's Orations, Horace, and Longinus.

Whatever you may determine in respect to yourself, your opinion on any part of our plan will be at all times gratefully received. As to salary, the matter is too much in embryo for me to say anything in that respect — only I will mention that I should not think of you on the occasion, were I not persuaded the station might be made more eligible than that you now fill.

Excuse the haste in which I write, and believe me to be

Your friend and humble servant,

W. WHITE.*

PHILADELPHIA, *October 23, 1784.*

November 23, 1789.

DEAR SIR :— I returned home the beginning of last week and should have answered your favour of the 9th inst., and returned you my earliest thanks for your kind attention to me, had not a multiplicity of business prevented me from giving you my thoughts as fully as I could wish. Even as yet I have not sufficient leisure to be explicit as to the plan of education which you were so good as to enclose me. The success you have met with in your most noble undertaking affords me singular satisfaction, and I feel myself zealously inclined to contribute my slender abilities as far as they can go. But I really dread the task of daily lessons as too great for my constitution. The consequences of a violent nervous fever which afflicted me near ten years ago still hang upon me, and are greatly aggravated by any unusual application. When Church duties come to be added to literary exertions, I am almost certain that I should soon sink under the burden. In every other point of view you may easily imagine how agreeable and flattering such an appointment would be. However, at any rate, an Head for the Establishment will easily be procured when the other members are duly organised. I am just setting out for Wilmington, so must defer saying anything relative to the general plan to another opportunity. As to the framing of a Church government these congregations will be ready to meet on that head, whenever notice is given them. What was the purport of the Act of Parliament which you mention^d, for I have not met with it? If it be any ways insidious *your* Plan after all will be the only one we can adopt. I saw

* *The Remains of the Rev. Charles Henry Wharton, D. D., with a Memoir of his Life*, by GEORGE WASHINGTON DOANE, D. D., Philadelphia, 1884, vol. i. pp. xxxv., xxxvi.

good Mr. West at Baltimore — he begs to be kindly remembered to you. He tells me that the prevailing idea at Chester-meeting was that no system could be finally settled in an Episcopal Church without actual Episcopacy. I wish a defect in this particular may not cause some uneasiness. A perfect union among ourselves, and a determined air of Independence among our Churches, are the only measures that can defeat the little politics of trans-marine clergymen, who seem unwilling to abandon the last grasp, as long as there is any prospect held out for continuing it. I suppose Mr. Carroll's pamphlet* must be published, but I have not met with it. I am told he chiefly labours to vindicate his Communion from the charge of uncharitableness.

With comp^{ts} to M^{rs} White, I remain D^r S^r,

Your most obliged and affectionate

B^r and humble Servant,

CHA^s H. WHARTON.†

Under date of August 2 Mr. Duché had written to his old friend and associate at the United Churches that he had communicated to the Archbishop the printed account of the Pennsylvania convention in May as well as Mr. Wharton's "Letter of Renunciation," which he characterises as "sensible and elegant," and added the following postscript: —

I shall always be happy to hear from you as often as possible. I mean to keep up a faithful correspondence with you and hope you will indulge me particularly with every step of your Ecclesiastical Proceedings, for I am truly anxious for y^e welfare of the Churches among you and highly approve of the fundamental Principles of its Government put forth in your Paper. You will soon have a Bishop either in Nova Scotia or in the State of Connecticut. The matter is in great

* The pamphlet referred to in Mr. Wharton's letter was the "Address to the Roman Catholics of America" published by the Rev. John Carroll, afterwards "appointed first Bishop of the new erected see of Baltimore in North America." This "Address" was in reply to "A Letter to the Roman Catholics of the City of Worcester [Eng.] from the late Chaplain of that Society, stating the motives which induced him to relinquish their Communion, and become a Member of the Protestant Church. . . . Philadelphia: Printed by Robert Aitken, M.D.CC.LXXXIV. 8vo, pp. 40." It was the reading of this pamphlet ere it appeared in print that drew from Dr. White the following testimony: "This production was perused by me with great pleasure in manuscript, and the subject of it caused much conversation during his stay in our city. The result was my entire conviction that the soundness of his arguments for the change of his religious profession was fully equalled by the sincerity and disinterestedness which accompanied the transaction." [Sprague's *Annals of the American Episcopal Pulpit*, p. 336.] Mr. Wharton replied to his antagonist, and two other publications on the subject appeared later from his pen. These pamphlets were republished in New York in 1817, and again in the "Remains" issued after Dr. Wharton's death under the editorial care of Bishop Doane.

† From the Bishop White MSS.

Forwardness, and your succession will then be as compleat as it is here.*

The passage of an Act of Parliament, to which reference has been made in Mr. Wharton's letter, providing for the ordination of American candidates for Holy Orders without the requirement of the usual oaths of allegiance, etc., confirmed the confident assurances given by the loyalist clergymen in London that a proper application for the episcopate would be favorably considered. The Rev. Dr. Alexander Murray, formerly missionary of the venerable society at Reading, Pa., writing to Dr. White, under date of September 16, 1784, while not obscurely indicating his own willingness to be invited to fill an American See, assures his correspondent that an enabling act for the consecration of a bishop could have been as readily obtained as that authorising the ordination of priests and deacons. There can be no doubt but that the persistent efforts of Dr. Seabury to obtain the office and administration he had been commissioned by the clergy of Connecticut to secure, though baffled by the tedious delays and hindrances arising from the connection of Church and State in England, had excited a sympathy for the American Churches, and had induced a disposition to relieve their spiritual wants that promised well for the success of the clergy of the Middle and Southern States in an application for a bishop when once their organisation had been effected and the measure of their conformity to the Church from which they were desirous of receiving this boon had been fully and finally ascertained. At this very time the exertions of Seabury had been crowned with success. Repulsed, or rather put off from time to time (in England), Dr. Seabury had, through the kind offices of leading English Churchmen and in compliance with the letter of instructions of those who had elected him, turned to the Catholic remainder of the Church in Scotland, and, after the requisite precedent formalities had been satisfactorily gone through with, was, on the Twenty-Second Sunday after Trinity, November 14, 1784, made by the laying on of the hands of the Scottish College a bishop in the Church of God. This act of faith done by the comparatively obscure and proscribed Bishops of Scotland was at once proclaimed to the world, and the following letter from the well-informed and interested Duché communicated the intelligence to Dr. White.

* From the Bishop White MSS.

ASYLUM, Decr 1, 1784.

MY DEAR SIR, — Having this Moment heard, that the Mail is to be made up this evening to go by y^e Packet, I have just time to tell you the following Particulars — that I have received your kind Letter with y^e Postscript from N. York by Mr. Hamilton, and am glad to find that you were at a Clerical Meeting there, and long to hear y^e Result of your Deliberations — That you are right in supposing Dr Seabury to be y^e person hinted at for a Bishop — That Dr Seabury was actually consecrated a Bishop about a Fortnight since by three Nonjuring Bishops at Aberdeen; not having had it in his Power to obtain a Consecration here — That the Succession of those Bishops is indisputable, of which he brings ample Testimonies; and that on invitation of y^e Convention of y^e Episcopal Clergy of Connecticut, he will embark for that State as soon as possible.

These Particulars you may depend on, and also that it is the sincere Wish of those who wish well to the Interest of y^e American Episcopal Church formed on the Model of our Church of England, that all y^e Episcopal Clergy would receive him with open Arms, and thus at once effectually prevent the growth of Sectaries, from a Division that must necessarily ensue if this Providential Offer is not immediately accepted. Dr Inglis writes to you by this Opportunity, and heartily joins me in recommending it warmly to you to give a proper, affectionate, and (I must say) filial reception to good Bishop Seabury, who goes over to you in a character truly primitive, unincumbered with any temporal Titles, or Honours or Interests, and perfectly disposed to yield Allegiance to y^e Civil Powers in your States. Much more I may have to say to you on this Subject. Your American Bishop, for so I must now call him, is a SCHOLAR, a GENTLEMAN, and I am happy to be able to say (what I verily believe to be true). A REAL CHRISTIAN. I hope you will take y^e earliest Opportunity of calling together a Convention, or Synod, or Convocation, or some General Ecclesiastical Meeting from the several States, to receive him, and at y^e same time, to fix upon an Ecclesiastical Constitution for your future Union and Comfort. I have not time to add more. I shall write again by Capt. Mercer, as I expect Bishop Seabury in London the 17th of this month. Pray call on M^{rs} Hopkinson and Dr Magaw, etc., and Mr Doz, and let them [know] that my Father and all our family are perfectly well, and very happy in our delightful Domestic scenes. Remember us all to M^{rs} White and every Friend. I would not have put you to y^e expence of this Letter by y^e Packet; but I thought y^e Immediate Intelligence would be of consequence to you. But pray give no Extracts of my Letter to any Friends nor suffer any Fact to be made Public. Read them to our Brethren if you think it necessary, but that is all.

I am yours, most affectionately,

J. DUCHÉ.

It was in this hurried communication, bearing in its style and displaying in its penmanship after the lapse of more than a century, traces of the haste and excitement of its writer, that the news was brought to White of the final close of the struggle for an American Episcopate, — a matter occupying the thoughts and commanding the labor of the best and most noted members of the Church of England since the early days of discovery and settlement.

Ere the receipt of this important letter there had come another communication from Wharton from which we get interesting glimpses of passing events.

December 6, '84.

DEAR SIR : — Your kind favour of the 30th ultimo is just come to hand, and I have a good opportunity by Mr Tatlow who is going up to-day to send you a few lines, reserving what I have most material to say till next week when I hope to have the pleasure of taking you by the hand. I will then communicate my ideas relative to the plan of education which you were so good as to send me, and open myself to you with all the unreservedness and confidence of friendship. In the mean time I hope you will give me credit for the most interested feelings respecting your laudable Institution.

I was at Chester only at the opening of the meeting. Had I remained there, I should have stood a good chance of incurring some formidable resentment. I hear that Mr Tilney who alone objected to the appointment of a certain Gentleman, was handled very roughly. However, the rest of the Company, I am told, were of his opinion before the meeting broke up. Mr West mentioned nothing of all this, but Mr Geddes informs me, he learnt it down at Chester. I heartily wish his information may be genuine. The old Tory John Westley has thrown off the mask that covered his ambition, but I trust he will be but little gratified in America. Asbury, I am told, is staunch in his attachment to the Church ; and his influence is such that it will hardly be superseded by any that Westley can oppose to it. If this Gentleman could be coolly argued with, he might be rendered highly instrumental in thwarting Westley's designs. If he should at any time be in Phil^a I could wish you to talk to him. Who wrote the *Essay on Matter** lately published in y^r City? Some attribute it to a Mr Edwards, formerly an Anabaptist Minister. It will prove a dangerous publication in the hands of an Illiterate. I last week sent a brief refutation of it to a friend, who desired my opinion on the subject.

* The work referred to, "*An Essay on Matter*, Philadelphia, 1784," is catalogued as anonymous in "The Catalogue of the Books of the Library Company of Philadelphia." 3 vols. 8vo. Philadelphia : 1856. Pp. 255, 259, 1070.

As I hear nothing of Mr Carroll's Pamphlet I begin to think with you that it is not intended for the public Eye.

I beg my respects to Mrs White and remain Dr Sr

Yr aff^{te} Br and obliged humble Servant,

C. H. WHARTON.*

Rev. Dr. WHITE.

A few days later another letter was received from the same source, evidently written after the interview proposed above had taken place.

NEW CASTLE, Dr 18, '84.

DEAR SIR:—I arrived at home yesterday for dinner in perfect health. I met at Wilmington with Mr. Carroll's production directed to me from the Printer. It is nearly three times as long as my letter and enters deeply into the apology for his tenets. It is not written with the spirit of liberality which I expected and gives me no credit for my professions of sincerity and uprightness. He considers my Letter as tending to excite animosities among the Inhabitants of these States. He endeavours to invalidate some of my quotations and absolutely denies that exclusive Salvation is a tenet of his Church. My character as a Gentleman and a Scholar is attacked pretty freely, and I am under an absolute necessity of vindicating it in these points of view. I know not what I shall do for some requisite books, having left the chief of mine at St. Marys. I must beg you at yr leisure to look into the 49th homily on the 24 of Matth. in S. Chrysostom's Works and see if the passage I have quoted (page 9) is not to be found there. It is in the most ancient editions. I shall set about my justification immediately, and hope to have it finished by the end of next month.

I must beg Mrs White to be kind enough to pack up carefully in the trunk a little flower piece which Aitken will send to your house. It will give me singular pleasure to learn that your hopes of 4000£ are realized for I really feel myself warmly interested in so laudable an undertaking. Mr and Mrs Geddes were much amused at my repeating some of their friend's humour. The recollection of part of it greatly wore off the tediousness of a solitary ride. With thanks to Mrs W. and self for the civilities I experienced under your hospitable Roof I remain Dr Sr your much obliged and obedient humble servant

C. H. WHARTON.

Following this letter from Mr. Wharton there came one from Mr. Parker of Boston written under date of January 25, 1785. After a few prefatory words respecting an act of kindness ren-

* From the Bishop White MSS.

dered by Dr. White, at the instance of the writer, to a person in need, Mr. Parker proceeds : —

I have just received a Letter directed to our Wardens and Vestry from the Rev^d Sam : Williamson of Childwall near Liverpool offering his Service to supply any vacant Churches in New England. He says he is a Native of America, was educated at Newark in the Delaware State, is well known to Dr Ewing, Mr Wilson and Dr Magaw of your City, that the climate of the Southern States disagrees with his health, and therefore wishes to obtain a Parish at the Northward. Pray do you know any thing of the man? As we have several vacant parishes in and about this town, he might be of service here ; if his character and Abilities are such as he represents them, I doubt not he might get a Living. If it is not imposing too much upon your kindness I would request the favour of you to inquire of those Gentlemen respecting his character. . . . I wish you success in your intended Academy and hope it will succeed beyond your most sanguine expectations. Is it true that Dr Smith is to cross the Atlantic for consecration, for so the public prints inform us, and indeed so he informs me by letter. But I suspect if he ever obtains it, it must be from Scotland and not from England. Dr Seabury I hear, meets with more difficulty than he expected and has not yet obtained his object. I take the Liberty to enclose a Letter for Mr Wharton. I beg the favour of your forwarding it to him.

I remain with great respect and esteem, Sir, your affectionate
Brother and very humble Servant

S. PARKER.

Rev^d Dr WHITE.

WILLIAM STEVENS PERRY.

THE LAW OF THE CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

CHAPTER VI.

GENESIS OF THE CONSTITUTION.

Conflicting Views among the Framers of the Constitution.

THE genesis of the Constitution would not be complete without showing the conflicting views and opinions among its framers and founders.

In Chapter Third I have stated that Bishop White was the most prominent man in the movement to establish a central government, and to bring the laity as an order into the councils of the Church. While this is true, still the first steps in either case were not taken by him, but by the Rev. Abraham Beach of New Jersey and the clergy of Maryland, as we have already seen. To whom are we indebted for the Catholic principles found in the Constitution, and for those principles found there not in accordance with the Divine Constitution and Canon Law of the Church? This question should be asked and answered here. It would be unjust to the framers of the Constitution not to let them, so far as possible, speak for themselves. In 1783 there appeared a pamphlet by Dr. White, although without his name as its author, entitled *The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered*. This pamphlet, together with the discussion it called forth, affords a most complete answer to the above question.

THE CASE OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCHES IN THE UNITED STATES CONSIDERED.

To make new articles of faith and doctrine, no man thinketh it lawful; new laws of government, what Commonwealth or Church is there which maketh not at one time or another? — *Hooker*.

Philadelphia: Printed by David C. Claypoole. 1783.

PREFACE.

It may be presumed, that the members of the Episcopal Churches, some from conviction, and others from the influence of ancient habits, entertain a preference for their own communion ; and that accordingly they are not a little anxious, to see some speedy and decisive measures adopted for its continuance. The author believes, therefore, that his undertaking needs no apology to the public ; and that those for whom it is designed will give him credit for his good intentions.

Nothing is farther from his wishes, than the reviving of such controversies as have been found destructive of good neighbourhood and the Christian temper ; especially as he conceives them to be unconnected with the peculiar situation of the churches in question. He has for this reason, avoided the discussion of subjects, on which Episcopalians differ from their fellow Christians ; and even of those, concerning which a latitude of sentiment has prevailed among themselves.

He thinks his design is subservient to the general cause of religion and virtue ; for a numerous society, losing the benefit of the stated ordinances within itself, cannot but severely feel the effect of such a change, on the piety and morals of its members. In this point of view, all good men must lament that cessation of public worship which has happened to many of the Episcopal Churches, and threatens to become universal.

The present work he also believes to be connected with the civil happiness of the community. A prejudice has prevailed with many, that the Episcopal Churches cannot otherwise exist than under the dominion of Great Britain. A Church government that would contain the constituent principles of the Church of England, and yet be independent of foreign jurisdiction or influence, would remove that anxiety which at present hangs heavy on the minds of many sincere persons.

Such is the natural tendency of this performance. If it should fail of effect on account of the insufficiency of the author, it may nevertheless be of advantage, by drawing to the subject the attention of others, better qualified for the undertaking.

CHAPTER I.

To form an idea of the situation of the Episcopal* Churches in the present crisis, we must observe the change their religious system has undergone in the late Revolution.

On whatever principles the independence of the United States may

* The general term 'Episcopal' is usually applied, among us, to the churches professing the religious principles of the Church of England. It is thought by the author to be sufficiently descriptive, because the other Episcopal Churches in America are known by names peculiar to themselves.

be supposed to rest ; whether merely on establishments which have very probable appearances of being permanent, or on withdrawing the protection of the former sovereign, or (as the author of these sheets believes) on the inherent right of the community to resist and effectually to exclude unconstitutional and oppressive claims, there result from it the reciprocal duties of protection and allegiance, enforced by the most powerful sanctions of natural and revealed religion.

It may reasonably be presumed, that, in general, the members of the Episcopal Churches are friendly to the principles, on which the present governments were formed ; a fact particularly obvious in the Southern States, where the Episcopalians, who are a majority of the citizens, have engaged and persevered in the war, with as much ardour and constancy as their neighbours. Many even of those whose sentiments were at first unfavorable to the Revolution, now wish for its final establishment, as a most happy event ; some from an earnest desire of peace, and others from the undistinguished oppressions and ravages of the British armies. Such persons accordingly acknowledge allegiance, and pay obedience to the sovereignty of the States.

Inconsistent with the duties resulting from this allegiance, would be their subjection to any spiritual jurisdiction connected with the temporal authority of a foreign state. Such a dependence is contrary to the fundamental principles of civil society, and therefore cannot be required by the Scriptures ; which, being accommodated to the civil policy of the world at large, neither interfered with the constitution of states as found established at the time of their promulgation, nor handed down to succeeding ages any injunctions of such a tendency.

To apply these observations to the case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States. They have been heretofore subject to the ecclesiastical authority of the Bishop of London. This authority was derived under a commission from the crown ; which, though destitute of legal operation, found a general acquiescence on the part of the churches ; being exercised no farther than to the necessary purposes of ordaining and licensing ministers. Hereby a connection was formed, between the spiritual authority in England and the Episcopal Churches in America, the latter constituting a part of the Bishop of London's diocese.

But this connection is dissolved by the Revolution. Had it been matter of right, it would have ceased with the authority of the crown ; being founded on consent, and the crown changed, it cannot be allowed of in future, consistently with the duties resulting from our allegiance.* Even suppose the Bishop of London hereafter exempted,

* Were the British colonies independent of their parent kingdom, the Episcopalians in this country would be a society independent of the national Church.

Dr. Chandler's Appeal farther defended, page 113.

by act of Parliament, from the necessity of exacting the oaths, a dependence on his lordship and his successors in that See, would be liable to the reproach of foreign influence, and render Episcopalians less qualified than those of other communions, to be entrusted by their country; neither (as may be presumed) will it be claimed after the acknowledgment of the civil independence, being contrary to a principle clearly implied in many of the institutions of the Church of England, particularly in the 34th Article of religion; which asserts, that 'every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church, ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying.' Though the Episcopal Churches in these States will not be national or legal establishments, the same principle applies, being the danger of foreign jurisdiction.

The ecclesiastical power over the greater number of the churches, formerly subsisting in some legislative bodies on this continent, is also abrogated by the Revolution. In the Southern States, where the Episcopal Churches were maintained by law, the assemblies might well have been supposed empowered, in conjunction with the other branches of legislation, to regulate their external government; but now, when the establishments are overturned, it would ill become those bodies, composed of men of various denominations (however respectable collectively and as individuals) to enact laws for the Episcopal Churches, which will no doubt, in common with others, claim and exercise the privilege of governing themselves.

All former jurisdiction over the churches being thus withdrawn, and the chain which held them together broken, it would seem, that their future continuance can be provided for only by voluntary associations for union and good government. It is therefore of the utmost consequence to discover and ascertain the principles, on which such associations should be framed.

CHAPTER II.

Whoever should consider the subject before us as merely speculative and propose the suggestions of his own judgment or fancy, without attention to the sentiments, habits, and circumstances of the people interested would probably have little weight, and would unquestionably not be useful. In the present investigation, therefore, it will be proper to keep in view the particular situation of the churches in question.

In most cases where spiritual jurisdiction has been established or defined, such has been the connection between Church and State, that it was scarcely possible to adopt measures, which did not show some traces of accommodation to political views; but this may be avoided

in the present instance, where all denominations of Christians are on a level, and no church is farther known to the public, than as a voluntary association of individuals, for a lawful and useful purpose. The effect of this should be the avoiding of whatever may give the churches the appearance of being subservient to party, or tend to unite their members on questions of a civil nature. This is unquestionably agreeable to the simplicity of the Gospel ; it is conceived to be also, under the present circumstances, agreeable to good policy ; for whatever church shall aim at such subjects, unless on account of an invasion of their religious privileges, will be suspected by all others, as aiming at the exclusive government of the country.

In the parent Church, though whatever regards religion may be enacted by the clergy in convocation, it must afterwards have the sanction of all other orders of men, comprehended in the Parliament. It will be necessary to deviate from the practice (though not from the principles) of that Church, by convening the clergy and laity in one body. The former will no doubt have an influence proportioned to the opinion entertained of their piety and learning ; but will never (it is presumed) wish to usurp an exclusive right of regulation ; a sentiment which cannot more properly be expressed than in the following words of that great defender of the Church of England Mr. Hooker ; 'The most natural and religious course of making laws, is that the matter of them be taken from the judgment of the wisest in those things which they are to concern. In matters of GOD, to set down a form of prayer, a solemn confession of the articles of the Christian Faith and ceremonies meet for the exercise of our religion, it were unnatural not to think the pastors and bishops of our souls, a great deal more fit than men of secular trades and callings — howbeit, when all that the wisdom of all sorts can do is done for the devising of laws in the Church, it is the general consent of all that giveth them the form and vigour of laws.' * And in another place 'but were it so that the clergy might give laws to all the rest, forasmuch as every estate doth desire to enlarge the bounds of their own liberties, it is easy to see how injurious this would prove to men of other conditions.' †

The power of electing a superior order of ministers ought to be in the clergy and laity together, they being both interested in the choice. In England, the bishops are appointed by the civil authority ; which was an usurpation of the crown at the Norman conquest, but since confirmed by acts of Parliament. The primitive churches were generally supplied by popular elections ; even in the city of Rome, the privilege of electing the bishop continued with the people to the tenth or eleventh century ; and near those times there are resolves of councils, that none should be promoted to ecclesiastical dignities, but by

* *Ecclesiastical Polity*, page 432.

† *Ibid.*, page 437.

election of the clergy and people. It cannot be denied, that this right vested in numerous bodies, occasioned great disorders ; which it is expected will be avoided, when the people shall exercise the right by representation.

Deprivation of the superior order of clergy should also be in the Church at large. In England, it has been sometimes done by the civil authority ; particularly in the instances of Queen Mary's Roman Catholic bishops by Queen Elizabeth, and of the non-juring bishops at the revolution ; which last occasioned a separation from the national Church, Sancroft and the others being still considered by their advocates as bishops of their respective sees, and Tillotson and his associates reprobated by them as schismatics. So far is the civil policy of England from permitting an entire separation of ecclesiastical authority, that in Queen Anne's reign, when Bishop Watson was deprived for immorality, it was allowed, that as a peer he might have objected to the archbishop's jurisdiction, provided he had pleaded his privilege in time. It is well known, that the interference of the civil authority in such instances as the preceding has been considered by many as inconsistent with ecclesiastical principles ; an objection which will be avoided, when deprivation can only be under regulations enacted by a fair representation of the churches, and by an authority entirely ecclesiastical. It is presumed, that none will so far mistake the principles of the Church of England, as to talk of the impossibility of depriving a bishop.

In England, Dioceses having been formed before parishes, a church supposes one common flock, subject to a bishop and sundry collegiate presbyters ; without the idea of its being necessarily divided into smaller communities connected with their respective parochial clergy ; the latter having been introduced some considerable time after the conversion of the nation to the Christian Faith. One natural consequence of this distinction, will be to retain in each church every power that need not be delegated for the good of the whole. Another, will be an equality of the churches ; and not, as in England, the subjection of all parish churches to their respective cathedrals.

The last circumstance to be here mentioned, is the impossibility that the churches should provide a support for that superior order of clergy, to which their acknowledged principles point ; of consequence, the duty assigned to that order ought not materially to interfere with their employments, in the station of parochial clergy ; the superintendence of each will therefore be confined to a small district ; a favorite idea with all moderate Episcopalians.

It is proposed to offer the outlines of a frame of church government founded on the preceding sentiments.

CHAPTER III.

The author offers the following sketch of a frame of government, though he is far from thinking it complete ; to make it so even according to his own ideas, would carry him beyond the compass intended in this essay.

As the churches in question extend over an immense space of country, it can never be expected, that representatives from each church should assemble in one place ; it will be more convenient for them to associate in small districts, from which representatives may be sent to three different bodies, the continent being supposed divided into that number of larger districts. From these may be elected a body representing the whole.

In each smaller district, there should be elected a general vestry or convention, consisting of a convenient number (the minister to be one) from the vestry or congregation of each church, or of every two or more churches, according to their respective ability of supporting a minister. They should elect a clergyman their permanent president ; who, in conjunction with other clergymen to be also appointed by the body, may exercise such powers as are purely spiritual, particularly that of admitting to the ministry ; the presiding clergyman, and others to be liable to be deprived for just causes, by a fair process, and under reasonable laws ; meetings to be held as often as occasion may require.

The assemblies in the three larger districts may consist of a convenient number of members, sent from each of the smaller districts severally within their bounds, equally composed of clergy and laity, and voted for by those orders promiscuously ; the presiding clergyman to be always one, and these bodies to meet once in every year.

The continental representative body may consist of a convenient number from each of the larger districts, formed equally of clergy and laity, and among the clergy, formed equally of presiding ministers and others ; to meet statedly once in three years. The use of this and the preceding representative bodies is to make such regulations, and receive appeals in such matters only, as shall be judged necessary for their continuing one religious communion.

These are (what was promised) no more than outlines ; which it will not be proper to dismiss, without a few observations on the degree of power to be exercised, in matters of faith, worship, and government.

For the doctrinal part, it would perhaps be sufficient to demand of all admitted to the ministry, or engaged in ecclesiastical legislation, the questions contained in the book of ordination ; which extend no farther than an acknowledgment of the Scriptures, as a rule of faith and life ; yet some general sanction may be given to the Thirty-nine Articles of

religion, so as to adopt their leading sense;* which is here proposed rather as a chain of union, than for exacting entire uniformity of sentiment. If the last be considered as a desirable object, the Articles have undeniably been found insufficient for the purpose; which is not here said from an opinion that such was the intention of the compilers, but rather with a conviction that they designedly left room for a considerable latitude of sentiment; if to the above there be objected the danger of a public opposition between ministers, this obvious answer may be made; that the strictest tests ever devised cannot be so effectual to prevent such conduct, as the regulation contained in the 53d canon; which considers it as indecent and punishable, independently of the merits of the doctrines litigated.

As to Divine worship, there must no doubt be somewhere the power of making necessary and convenient alterations in the service of the Church. But it ought to be used with great moderation; otherwise the communion will become divided into an infinite number of smaller ones, all differing from one another and from that in England; from whence we may expect considerable numbers to migrate hereafter to this country; who if they find too wide a deviation from the ancient practice, will probably form an independent communion of their own. Whatever may in other respects be determined on this head, it is presumed the Episcopalians are generally attached to that characteristic of their communion, which prescribes a settled form of prayer.

On the subject of government, whether civil or ecclesiastical, there is great truth and beauty in the following observation of the present Bishop of S. Asaph, 'the great art of governing consists in not governing too much.' Perhaps it would be sufficient, if an immoral life were followed by exclusion from the sacrament and ecclesiastical employment; deprivation from church benefices following of course. The above is not to be understood as excluding the enforcing such rules, as are necessary to preserve decency and order. As to excommunication or an entire separation from the Church, however necessary it was in the primitive ages, when Christianity itself, being not generally known, and misrepresented as a sanction for lewdness, treason and clandestine murders, must have been essentially wounded by

* Suppose, for instance, a form RESEMBLING that which Dr. Ferdinando Warner, a late ecclesiastical Historian of the Episcopal Church, says (book 16) was proposed in the reign of Charles II by the Lord Keeper Bridgman, Bishop Wilkins and Chief Justice Hale, 'to serve instead of all former subscriptions.' The form was this, 'I do hereby profess and declare, that I approve the doctrine, worship and government established in the Church of England, as containing all things necessary to salvation, and that I will not endeavour by myself or any other, directly or indirectly, to bring in any doctrine contrary to that which is so established; and I do hereby promise that I will continue in the Church of England, and will not do anything to disturb the peace thereof.'

the immoralities of any of its professors ; there is great room to doubt of their being the same use in it at present, when the vices of a professing Christian are universally known to be opposite to the precepts of his religion. Such are the tyranny and hypocrisy too frequently arising from the exercise of this power, that it may be thought safest to leave men to those great sanctions of duty, the will of GOD and a future retribution ; attended as they will generally be with a sense of shame, dissuading from actions so notoriously scandalous, as to be a foundation for church censures.

In the preceding pages, the idea of superintending ministers has been introduced ; but not a word has been said of the succession supposed necessary to constitute the Episcopal character ; and this has been on purpose postponed, as demanding a more minute discussion.

CHAPTER IV.

On the subject of Episcopacy, the general opinion of the churches in question is of peculiar consequence ; yet it can be collected only from circumstances ; to assist in ascertaining it, the two following facts are stated.

Wherever these churches have been erected, the ecclesiastical government of the Church of England has been adhered to ; they have depended on the English bishops for ordination of their clergy, and on no occasion expressed a dissatisfaction with Episcopacy. This, considering the liberty they enjoyed in common with others, of forming their churches on whatever plan they liked best, is a presumptive proof of their preferring the Episcopal government ; especially as it subjected them under the former connection to many inconveniences, such as sending to the distance of three thousand miles for ordination, the scandal sometimes brought on the Church by the ordination of low and vicious persons,* the difficulty of getting rid of immoral ministers, and that several of the clergy formed attachments of which this country has been always jealous, and which have at last proved extremely prejudicial to her interests.

On the other hand, there cannot be produced an instance of laymen in America, unless in the very infancy of the settlements, soliciting the introduction of a bishop ; † it was probably by a great majority of them thought an hazardous experiment. How far the prerogative of the king as head of the Church might be construed to extend over the colonies, whether a bishop would bring with him that part of the law which respects ecclesiastical matters, and whether the civil powers vested in bishops in England would accompany that order to America,

* Generally by deceptions on the Bishop of London.

† If there has been any, it must have been from so few, as rather to corroborate than weaken the sentiment conveyed.

were questions which for aught they knew would include principles and produce consequences, dangerous and destructive to their civil rights.*

From these two facts it may fairly be inferred, that the Episcopalians on this continent will wish to institute among themselves an Episcopal government, as soon as it shall appear practicable, and that this government will not be attended with the danger of tyranny, either temporal or spiritual.

But it is generally understood, that the succession cannot at present be obtained. From the parent Church most unquestionably it cannot; whether from any is presumed to be more than we can at present be informed. But the proposal to constitute a frame of government, the execution of which shall depend on the pleasure of persons unknown, differing from us in language, habits, and perhaps in religious principles, has too ludicrous an appearance to deserve consideration; the peculiar circumstances of the war in which our country is engaged preclude us from procuring the succession in those quarters to which alone application could consistently be made; the danger of offending the British government constraining (perhaps) a refusal of what, it would of course be indelicate in us to ask. Now, on the other hand, to depart from Episcopacy, would be giving up a leading characteristic of the communion; which, however indifferently considered as to Divine appointment, might be productive of all the evils generally attending changes of this sort. On the other hand, by delaying to adopt measures for the continuance of the ministry, the very existence of the churches is hazarded, and duties of positive and indispensable obligation are neglected.

The conduct meant to be recommended, as founded on the preceding sentiments, is to include in the proposed frame of government a general approbation of Episcopacy, and a declaration of an intention to procure the succession, as soon as conveniently may be; but in the mean time to carry the plan into effect without waiting for the succession.

The first part of this proposal is conceived to be founded on the

* Whether the above appendages would have accompanied an English bishop to America, the author is no judge. That they were generally feared by the Episcopalian laity, he thinks the only way of accounting for the cold reception they gave (a fact universally known) to every proposal for the introduction of a bishop. Those who pleaded for the measure on a plan purely spiritual, thought he would not be invested, by the laws of England, with such powers; but in case it had proved otherwise, they proposed the limiting him by act of Parliament. What the people would have thought of measures, which must have required an act of that body to render them harmless, no person formerly acquainted with their temper and sentiments need be told; and whether they judged right or not, recent events have abundantly shown.

plain dictates of propriety, prudence, and moderation; for if the undertaking proceed on acknowledged principles, there will be far less shock to ancient habits, and less cause of intestine divisions, than if new principles are to be sought for and established. To illustrate this by an allusion; had our old governments been so adjusted to the genius of the people and their present circumstances, as at the Revolution to have required no farther change than what necessarily arose from the extinction of royal authority, it is obvious, that many pernicious controversies would have been prevented. Such, however, except in a few instances, was not the happiness of the Colonies. But it is precisely the situation of the Episcopal Churches in their religious concerns; none of their constituent principles being thereby changed, but what were founded on the authority of the king.

In the minds of some, the idea of the Episcopacy will be connected with that of immoderate power; to which it may be answered, that power becomes dangerous, not from the precedency of one man, but from his being independent. Had Rome been governed by a presbytery instead of a bishop; and had that presbytery been invested with the independent riches and dominion of the Papal See; it is easy to conceive, of their acquiring as much power over the Christian world as was ever known in a Gregory or a Paul.

It may be further objected, that Episcopacy is anti-republican; and therefore opposed to those ideas which all good citizens ought to promote, for securing the peace and happiness of the community. But this supposed relation between Episcopacy and monarchy arises from confounding English Episcopacy with the subject at large. In the early ages of the Church, it was customary to debate and determine in a general concourse of all Christians in the same city; among whom the bishop was no more than president. Matters were indeed too often conducted tumultuously, and after a manner which no prudent and peaceable man would wish to see imitated; but the churches were not the less Episcopal on that account. Very few systems of religious discipline on this continent are equally republican with that proposed in the preceding pages. The adage of King James I, 'No Bishop no King,' and 'No King no Bishop,' ought only to be understood concerning that degree of Episcopal power, together with its civil appendages, of which he certainly meant it.

But it will be also said, that the very name of 'Bishop' is offensive; if so, change it for another; let the superior clergyman be a president, a superintendent, or in plain English, and, according to the literal translation of the original, an overseer. However, if names are to be reprobated, because the powers annexed to them have been abused, there are few appropriated to either civil or ecclesiastical distinctions, which would retain their places in our catalogue.

The other part of the proposal was an immediate execution of the plan, without waiting for the Episcopal succession. This is founded on the presumption, that the worship of GOD and the instruction and reformation of the people are the principal objects of ecclesiastical discipline: if so, to relinquish them from a scrupulous adherence to Episcopacy, is sacrificing the substance to the ceremony.

It will be said, we ought to continue as we are, with the hope of obtaining it hereafter. But are the acknowledged ordinances of CHRIST's holy religion to be suspended for years, perhaps as long as the present generation shall continue, out of delicacy to a disputed point, and that relating only to externals? It is submitted, how far such ideas encourage the suspicion of want of attachment to any particular church, except so far as is subservient to some civil system. All the obligations of conformity to the Divine ordinances, all the arguments which prove the connexion between public worship and the morals of a people, combine to urge the adopting some speedy measures, to provide for the public ministry in these churches; if such as have been above recommended should be adopted, and the Episcopal succession afterwards obtained, any supposed imperfections of the intermediate ordinations might, if it were judged proper, be supplied without acknowledging their nullity, by a *conditional* ordination resembling that of *conditional baptism* in the liturgy; the above was an expedient proposed by Archbishop Tillotson, Bishops Patrick, Stillingfleet, and others, at the revolution, and had been actually practised in Ireland by Archbishop Bramhall.*

But it will be said, the dropping the succession even for a time would be a departure from the principles of the Church of England. This prejudice is too common not to deserve particular attention.

CHAPTER V.

It would be to the greatest degree surprising, if the Church of England, acknowledged by all Protestant churches to lay a sufficient stress on the essential doctrines and duties of the Gospel, should be found so immoderately attached to a matter of external order, as must in some cases be ruinous to her communion. But, far from this, it will not be difficult to prove, that a temporary departure from Episcopacy in the present instance would be warranted by her doctrines, by her practice, and by the principles on which Episcopal government is asserted.

Whatever that Church holds must be included in the 'Thirty-nine Articles of Religion;' which were evidently intended for a comprehensive system of necessary doctrine. But what say these articles on the present subject? Simply, that 'the book of consecration of arch-

* *Nichol's Defence of the Church of England*, Introduction.

bishops and bishops and the ordering of priests and deacons, doth contain all things necessary thereunto ; neither hath it any thing that of itself is superstitious and ungodly.* The canons speak the same sense censuring those who shall 'affirm that the government of the Church of England by archbishops, bishops, &c. is antichristian, or repugnant to the word of GOD.'† And those who shall 'affirm that the form and manner of making and consecrating bishops, priests, and deacons, containeth any thing in it that is repugnant to the word of GOD, or that they who are thus made bishops, &c. are not lawfully made, &c.'‡

How can such moderation of sentiment and expression be justified, if the Episcopal succession be so binding, as to allow no deviation in a case of extreme necessity? Had the Church of England decreed concerning baptism and the LORD'S supper, only that they were 'not repugnant to the word of GOD,' and that her offices for those sacraments were 'not superstitious and ungodly,' would she not be censured by almost all Christendom, as renouncing the obligation of those sacraments? Equally improper would be the application of such moderate expressions to Episcopacy if (as some imagine) she considers it to be as much binding as baptism and the LORD'S supper.

The book of consecration and ordination carries the idea no farther, except that the preface as altered at the Restoration (for it was not so in the old preface) affirms that 'from the Apostles' times there have been these orders in CHRIST'S Church, bishops, priests, and deacons.' But there is an evident difference between this and the asserting the unlawfulness of deviating from that practice in an instance, extraordinary and unprovided for.

Next to the doctrine of the Church, let us enquire, whether her practice will furnish us with a precedent to justify the liberty we plead.

Many of the English Protestants, during the persecution by Queen Mary, took refuge in foreign countries, particularly in Germany and Geneva. When Protestantism revived at the auspicious accession of Queen Elizabeth, and at the same time a cloud was gathering on the continent in consequence of the emperor's victories over the princes of the Smalcaldic league, many of the exiles returned to their native land ; some of whom, during their absence, had been ordained according to the customs of the countries where they had resided ; these were admitted without re-ordination to preach and hold benefices ; one of them § was promoted to a deanry ; but at the same time, as several of them were endeavouring to make innovations in the established Church, it was provided in a law [13th Elizabeth 12] that 'whoever shall pretend to be a priest or minister of GOD'S holy Word,

* Article 36.

† Canon 7.

‡ Canon 8.

§ Whittingham.

by reason of any other form of institution, consecration or ordering, than the form set forth by act of Parliament, before the Feast of the Nativity of CHRIST next ensuing, shall in the presence of the bishop — declare his assent and subscribe to all the articles of religion agreed on, &c.* Here existed an extraordinary occasion, not provided for in the institutions for common use; the exigency of the case seems to have been considered; and there followed a toleration, if not implied approbation, of a departure in that instance from Episcopal ordination. There cannot be expected another example, because no similar instance of necessity has happened; unless that at the Restoration be considered as such; but, it is presumed, no stress will be laid on the omission of the like indulgence at that period; when the minds of the ruling Episcopalians, irritated by recent sufferings, were less intent on conciliation than on retaliation.†

Let us next take a view of the grounds on which the authority of Episcopacy is asserted.

The advocates for this form maintain, that there having been an Episcopal power originally lodged by JESUS CHRIST with his Apostles, and by them exercised generally in person, but sometimes by delegation (as in the instances of Timothy and Titus) the same was conveyed by them before their decease to one pastor in each church, which generally comprehended all the Christians in a city and a convenient surrounding district. Thus were created the Apostolic successors, who, on account of their settled residence are called bishops *by restraint*; whereas the Apostles themselves were bishops *at large*, exercising Episcopal power over all the churches, except in the case of S. James, who from the beginning was bishop of Jerusalem. From this time the word 'episcopos,' used in the New Testament indiscriminately with the word 'presbuteros,' (particularly in the 20th chapter of the Acts where the same persons are called 'episcopoi' and 'presbuteroi,') became *appropriated* to the superior order of ministers. That the Apostles were thus succeeded by an order of ministers supe-

* Bishop Burnet says [*History of His Own Times*, anno 1661] that until the Act of Uniformity, passed soon after the Restoration, 'those who came to England from the foreign churches had not been required to be ordained among us.' If so, the argument founded on practice extends farther than it has been here urged. The act of Elizabeth, however, had no operation beyond the Christmas next ensuing; neither indeed did it pronounce that a good ordination which would have been otherwise defective; but its being meant to comprehend those who were AT THAT TIME invested with foreign non-episcopalian ordination, is evident from their being actually allowed to preach and hold benefices, on the condition of their subscribing the Thirty-nine Articles.

† Bishop Burnet assigns a reason still less excusable; that many great preferments were in the hands of obnoxious persons, who, on account of their services towards the Restoration, could not otherwise be ejected, than by making the terms of conformity difficult. *History of His Own Times*, anno 1661.

rior to pastors in general, Episcopalians think they prove by the testimonies of the ancient fathers, and from the improbability that so great an innovation (as some conceive it) could have found general and peaceable possession in the second or third century, when Episcopacy is on both sides acknowledged to have been prevalent.* The argument is here concisely stated, but (as is believed) impartially, the manner in which the subject is handled by Mr. Hooker and Bishop Hoadly being particularly kept in view.

Can any reasonable rule of construction make this amount to more than ancient and apostolic practice? That the Apostles adopted any particular form, affords a presumption of its being the best, all circumstances at that time considered; but to make it unalterably binding, it must be shown enjoined in positive precept. Bishop Hoadly clearly points out this distinction in his answer to Dr. Calamy. The latter having considered it as the sense of the Church, in the preface to the ordinal, that the three orders were of Divine appointment, and urged it as a reason for non-conformity; the bishop with evident propriety, remarks that the service pronounces no such thing; and that therefore Dr. Calamy created a difficulty, where the Church had made none; there being 'some difference,' (says he) 'between these two sentences — bishops, priests, and deacons, are three distinct orders in the Church by *Divine appointment* — and — *from the Apostles' time* there have been in CHRIST'S Church bishops, priests, and deacons.' † ‡

Now, if the form of Church government rests on no other foundation, than ancient and Apostolic *practice*, it is humbly submitted to consideration, whether Episcopalians will not be thought scarcely deserving the name of Christians, should they, rather than consent to a temporary deviation, abandon every ordinance of positive and Divine appointment.

Any person, reading what some divines of the Church of England have written against dissenters, would in general widely mistake their

* The original of the order of bishops was from the presbyters choosing one from among themselves to be a stated president in their assemblies, in the 2d or 3d century. Smectymnuan divines, as quoted in Neale's *History of the Puritans*, anno 1640.

† *Reasonableness of Conformity*, part I.

‡ The same distinction is accurately drawn and fully proved by Stillingfleet in the *Irenicum*. But as that learned prelate was afterwards dissatisfied with his work (the most probably not with that part of it which would have been to our purpose) it might seem uncandid to cite the authority of his OPINION. Burnet, his contemporary and friend, says [*History of His Own Times*, anno 1661] 'to avoid the imputation that book brought on him, he went into the humours of an high sort of people beyond his own sense of things.' The book, however, was it seems easier RETRACTED than REFUTED: for though offensive to many of both parties, it was managed (says the same author) with so much learning and skill, that none of either side ever undertook to answer it.

meaning, should he apply to the subject before us, the censures he will sometimes meet with, which have in view, not merely the merits of the question, but the duty of conforming to the established Church, in all things not contrary to the law of God. Thus Bishop Stillingfleet, who at the Restoration had written with great tenderness towards the dissenters, and many years afterwards preached a sermon on a public occasion, containing severe animadversions on their separation; on being accused of inconsistency, replies (in the preface to his treatise on the unlawfulness of separation) that the former was 'before the laws were established;' meaning principally the Act of Uniformity. So also Bishop Hoadly says, the acceptance of re-ordination by the dissenting ministers, would not be a denial of that right, which (as they conceived) presbyters had to ordain; but a confession that their former ordination was 'so far null and void, that God did not approve the exercise of that right in opposition to the lawful settled method.'* Dr. Henry Maurice also, who has written with great learning and reputation in defence of Episcopacy, makes the same distinction; observing that the 'dissenters do foreign churches great injustice when they concern them in their quarrel,' the ordination of the latter being 'not only without, but in opposition to bishops, against all the established laws of this Church, &c.'† Even where the same distinction is not expressed, it is generally implied. Whether the above censures are well or ill founded, is a question that has no connection with our subject; they cannot be thought applicable to the liberty here pleaded.‡

Again, it cannot be denied, that some writers of the Church of England apply very strong expressions to Episcopacy, calling it a Divine appointment, the ordinance of CHRIST, and the law of God, and pronounce it to be of Divine right. Yet, in reason they ought to be understood only as asserting it to be binding, wherever it can conveniently be had: not that law and gospel are to cease rather than Episcopacy. Mr. Hooker, who uses such strong expressions, makes nevertheless a clear distinction between matters of necessity and those of ecclesiastical polity; as may be seen at large in his third and fourth

* *Reply to Objections against Episcopal Ordination.*

† Maurice against Clarkson, page 453.

‡ In England, the members of the established Church consider the dissenters as blameable in not conforming to it as such, there being nothing required contrary to the law of God. These on the other hand blame the members of the establishment, for not yielding to their conscientious scruples, which thus exclude them from public offices, and subject them to considerable burthens. Such were the principal sources of the animosities which have subsisted between the two parties; and hence arises an argument for charity and mutual forbearance among religious societies in America, with whom the same causes of contention and mutual censure have no place, and with whom of course the same degree of bitterness would be less excusable than in England.

books. Even Archbishop Whitgift, said by some* to have been the first in his high station, under whose patronage such pretensions were annexed to Episcopacy, and whose zeal for that form and the other rights of the Church, made him verily believe in the famous conference at Hampton Court, that 'the king spoke by the Spirit of God,' is quoted by Bishop Stillington, as asserting that 'no kind of government is expressed in the Word or can necessarily be concluded from thence.'† In short, particular expressions which writers use from zeal for that form they endeavour to establish, are not to be given in proof of their opinions, concerning the conduct suited to extraordinary occasions. Many instances to the same purpose might be produced of English divines qualifying such high expressions and guarding against seeming consequences; but this part of the subject shall conclude with the authority of a clergyman of this country, who a few years ago wrote on Episcopal government. He insists on it as of Divine right, asserts that 'the laws relating to it bind as strongly as the laws which oblige us to receive baptism or the holy Eucharist,'‡ and that 'if the succession be once broken, not all the men on earth, not all the angels of heaven, without an immediate commission from CHRIST, can restore it.'§ Nevertheless, he acknowledges 'the necessity of bishops is no more than a general necessity, or in other words, bishops according to the belief of the Church of England, are necessary only where they can be had.'|| He then distinguishes between cases where the necessity is real, and those where Episcopacy had been willingly and expressly rejected, as by the people of Scotland and the English dissenters.

Now if even those who hold Episcopacy to be of Divine right, conceive the obligation to it to be not binding when that idea would be destructive of public worship, much more must *they* think so, who indeed venerate and prefer that form as the most ancient and eligible, but without any idea of Divine right in the case. This the author believes to be the sentiment of the great body of Episcopalians in America; in which respect they have in their favour *unquestionably* the sense of the Church of England, and, *as he believes*, the opinions of her most distinguished prelates for piety, virtue and abilities.

* Dr. Warner says [book 14] that 'Archbishop Bancroft was the first man who had preached up the divine right of Episcopacy in the Church of England.' The first occasion of his doing this, is said by others to have been when he was Whitgift's chaplain.

† *Irenicum*, chapter 38.

‡ *Dr. Chandler's Appeal*, page 7.

§ *Ibid.*, page 4.

|| *Chandler's Appeal defended*, page 68.

CHAPTER VI.

It is to be expected, that the far greater number of writers in defence of Episcopal government, confine their observations to the ordinary state of the Church, without giving their opinions on supposed cases of necessity. Yet, if it were required to multiply authorities, and writers were consulted with that view, it is probable that many more than the following might be produced. But, as the lawfulness of deviation, in cases of necessity, is a fair inference from the sentiments of expressly to the purpose (perhaps) all, it will be sufficient if those quoted rank among the most respectable for their authority.

The first mentioned shall be the venerable Hooker. His books on ecclesiastical polity are universally allowed to be a work of masterly judgment, and deep erudition; they are frequently spoken of as containing the most rational and complete defence of the Church of England; and were recommended by King Charles I (whose attachment to Episcopacy will not be doubted) as the best for fixing the principles of his children, on those questions which had distracted the nation. This accomplished writer, after asserting with great zeal the authority of Episcopal government, makes the following exception; 'when the *exigence of necessity* doth constrain to leave the usual ways of the Church, which otherwise we would willingly keep; when the Church must needs have some ordained and neither hath nor can have possibly a bishop to ordain; in case of *such necessity* the law of God hath oftentimes and may give place: and therefore we are not, simply and without exception, to urge a lineal descent of power from the Apostles, by continued succession in every effectual ordination.'*

The same great man, speaking in another place of some churches not Episcopal, says, 'this their defect and imperfection, I had rather lament in such a case than exaggerate; considering that men oftentimes, without any fault of their own, may be driven to want that kind of polity or regiment, which is best; and to content themselves with that which either the irremediable error of former times, or the *necessity of the present* hath cast upon them.'†

Had Mr. Hooker been asked to define '*the exigence of necessity*,' could he have imagined any more urgent than the case in question? Or had he been enquired of concerning the '*necessities of present times*,' could he have mentioned any in the cases to which he alludes (those of Scotland and Geneva,) so strongly pleading for the liberty he allows, as those now existing in America?

The name of Bishop Hoadly will probably be as long remembered, as any on the list of British worthies; and will never be mentioned

* *Ecclesiastical Polity*, book 7, section 14.

† *Ibid.*, book 3, section 11.

without veneration of the strength of his abilities, the liberality of his sentiments, and his enlightened zeal for civil liberty. He has written in defence of Episcopal government, with more argument and better temper than is commonly to be met with in controversial writings. This amiable prelate expresses himself as follows, 'as to the credit of the Reformed Churches abroad we think it no presumption, as we censure them not, who *in a case of necessity* went out of the ordinary method, so to expect they will not censure us for not approving such irregularities, where there is *no such necessity* for them.'* In another place he says, 'for my own part I cannot argue that Episcopacy is *essential* to a Christian Church, because it is of Apostolical institution; and on the other hand, I do argue, that we are obliged to the utmost of our knowledge, to conform ourselves to the Apostolical model, unless in such where the imitation is *impracticable* or would manifestly do more hurt than good to the Church of CHRIST; neither of which can possibly be affirmed in the *ordinary* state of the Church.'†

What necessity was there of the 'Reformed Churches abroad' equal to ours? Is not an immediate imitation of the ancient usage '*impracticable*?' Would not such a plan as has been proposed be conforming (as far as circumstances allow) to our ideas of 'the Apostolic model?'

The character of Archbishop Usher for extensive learning and fervent piety is generally known; and is distinguished both by his great moderation on the subject of Episcopacy, and by the service it has received from his indefatigable researches. In a letter to Dr. Bernard he writes thus, 'in places where bishops *cannot be had*, the ordination of presbyters stands valid.'‡ What part of the Christian world could the learned primate have named, of which it could have been so properly said as it may be of ours, that 'ordination by bishops *cannot be had*?'

The great reformer and martyr Archbishop Cranmer was one of the first characters of the age in which he lived, for learning, piety, and virtue; and is supposed to have done more than any other towards compiling the liturgy of the Church of England; 'His equal (says Dr. Warner) was never yet seen in the see of Canterbury, and I will take upon me to say, that his superior never will.' In the reign of Henry VIII according to Bishop Burnet, § there were proposed by the King, to this great man, in conjunction with other learned divines, certain questions, among which are the two following, with the Archbishop's answers annexed:

Question. Whether if it fortun'd a Prince Christian, to conquer

* *Reasonableness of Conformity*, part I.

† *Defence of Episcopal Ordination*, conclusion.

‡ Quoted from Neale's History.

§ *History of the Reformation*, anno 1540. Stillingfleet, with less appearance of authenticity, says it was in the reign of Edward VI.

certain dominions of infidels, having none but the temporal learned men with him, it be defended by God's law, that he and they should preach the word of God there or no, and also make and constitute priests there or no?

Answer. It is not against God's law; but contrariwise they ought indeed so to do; and there be histories that witness, that some Christian princes and other laymen have done the same.

Question. Whether it be defended by God's law, that if it so fortune that all the bishops and priests of a region were dead; and that the word of God should remain there unpreached; and the sacrament of baptism and others unministered; that the King of that region should make bishops and priests to supply the same or no?

Answer. It is not forbidden by God's law.

The above may be offered as the opinions of not only Cranmer, but also of most of the eminent bishops and other clergy of that period; for whoever will attend to all the questions with the several answers as recorded by Burnet,* will find, that although the Archbishop seems singular in his sentiments as to the original institution of bishops and priests, they generally agree with him on the supposed occasions of necessity. On the former subject, the learned historian believes, that Cranmer soon afterwards changed his opinion: but the reason assigned for that belief, if it be well founded,† does not extend to the purpose for which his authority is here cited.

Now every circumstance in the cases supposed makes the principle apply, with the greater force, to that now under consideration. If a Christian king may on an emergency constitute a bishop, much more may the whole body of the churches interested; especially when they interfere not thereby with the civil magistrate. If a prince would be justifiable in taking such a step, rather than have recourse to the spiritual authority of some neighbouring and allied kingdom, much more would we, who labour under peculiar political difficulties. If it were commendable on the mere hope of converting infidels to the Christian Faith, it would be more so, for the purpose of maintaining the principles of Christian knowledge and practice, among those who are already

* *History of the Reformation*, Appendix to vol. i.

† The reason is Cranmer's signing the book called "the erudition of a Christian man." This book has led some to believe that the Archbishop's principles on Church government were unsettled at the time of its publication. That it contradicts itself on that subject, is certain; but this was owing not to Cranmer's inconsistency, but that of the king. In the answers of the former as given by Burnet, his sentiments seem fully fixed, and (perhaps) are reconcileable with the Episcopal plan, according to the distinction taken between the APPROPRIATED and LARGER meanings of the word 'Bishop.' As to 'the erudition,' Guthrie says [*History of England*, vol. iii. page 597], 'the writings were modelled by the King, as he wanted them to appear before the Parliament and public;' and Dr. Warner says [book II.] 'it is more probably a declaration of the King's religion, than of any other man's in the kingdom.'

of the number of its professors. If a prince ought to do this from concern for the spiritual welfare of his subjects, much rather ought we, for that of ourselves and our children.

On the credit of the preceding names, the author rests this the last part of his subject; and if his sentiments should meet with an unfavorable reception, he will find no small consolation from being in a company so respectable.

Perhaps, however, there would be little room for difference of sentiment among the well informed, if the matter were generally taken up with seriousness and moderation, and were to rest on religious principles alone. But unhappily there are some, in whose ideas the existence of their Church is so connected with that of the civil government of Britain, as to preclude their concurrence in any system, formed on a presumed final separation of the two countries. Prejudices of this sort will admit of no conviction but such as may arise from future events; and are therefore no farther considered in this performance, than with a sincere sorrow, that any persons, professing to be of the communion of the Church of England, should so far mistake the principles of that Church, as to imagine them widely different from what form the religion of the Scriptures; which, as Bishop Sherlock observes, 'stand clear of all disputes about the rights of princes and subjects; so that such disputes must be left to be decided by principles of natural equity and the constitution of the country.' *

As for those who are convinced that the 'United States' have risen to an independent rank among the nations or who even think that such may probably be the event of the war, they are loudly called on to adopt measures for the continuance of their churches, as they regard the public worship of GOD, the foundation of which is immutable; as they esteem the benefit of the sacraments, which were instituted by the supreme bishop of the Church; and as they are bound to obey the Scriptures, which enjoin us 'not to forsake the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is.'

More especially is this their duty, if they entertain a peculiar preference for the principles and worship of their own communion, from a persuasion of their superior excellence. That the Church of England

* Vol. iv. Discourse 13th.

The indefeasible right of kings is pretended to be founded on certain passages of Scripture. The author takes the liberty of referring to the very sensible sermon above quoted, for an easy and natural explanation of the passages alluded to; whereby they are vindicated from a sense which makes the Gospel an engine of despotism and oppression, and which, however sincerely believed by some, is with others a mere trick of state. Although Bishop Sherlock's reputation in the Church of England is generally known, it may be proper to mention, that his sermons are among the books formerly sent out by the honourable 'Society for Propagating the Gospel,' to be distributed by their missionaries.

is a creature of the state, an engine of civil policy, and no otherwise to be maintained than by human laws, has been said by some, as a reason for their dissenting from her. If the same prejudice has been with others a reason for conformity, it is to be hoped they are comparatively few, and that the great majority of Episcopalians, believing that their faith and worship are rational and Scriptural, have no doubt of their being supported, independent of state establishments; nay, it is presumed there are many, who, while they sincerely love their fellow Christians of every denomination, knowing (as one of their prayers expresses) that the 'body of CHRIST' comprehends 'the blessed company of all faithful people,' are more especially attached to their own mode of worship, *perhaps* from education, but *as they conceive*, from its being most agreeable to reason and Scripture, and its most nearly resembling the pattern of the purest ages of the Church. On the consciences of such, above all others, may be pressed the obligation of adopting speedy and decisive measures, to prevent their being scattered 'like sheep without a shepherd,' and to continue the use of that form of divine service, which they believe to be 'worshipping the LORD in the beauty of holiness.'

Contemporary Literature.

Biography.

CHARLES READE was certainly one of the most powerful of recent English novelists.* Sometimes he betrays, however, an excess of power, and we feel that too great facility is fatal to the attainment of the highest rank in art. Wise was the painter who, finding his right hand growing too swift and ready in its touches, placed the brush in his left, that he might keep it more directly under the control of eye and brain. It is no wonder, however, that the relatives who have written the biography of this novelist should sometimes appear to overestimate his place in literature. Of course the biography of such a man, blending in his own person the dignity of the Oxford don and the Bohemianism of an irresponsible *littérateur*, must be fascinating. The style in which it is written renders it sometimes singularly amusing. In these days of much writing, and of much good writing, we have seldom met with so badly written a book as the one before us. The Rev. Compton Reade, who is accountable for this writing, gives no evidence of having been "a foundation member of his uncle's college." What are we to think of an author who uses the word *passim* in the sense of "in passing!" who talks of an "*omnivorous devourer of books*," who speaks of ducklings as "termagants," and employs such gibberish as "*verba, verberima*!" who talks of school life as an epoch, and repeatedly refers to a severe schoolmaster as "*a vivisector!*" Yet when we want to learn our way we pay small heed to the grammar or pronunciation of a rustic who directs us, and Mr. Compton Reade has given us details and incidents in the life of his uncle which even his own flippant, bombastic, and absurd language cannot deprive of the interest which they will have for all who have read *Hard Cash*, or *Peg Woffington*. It will be interesting to American readers to learn how sensitive Reade was to criticism, and particularly to American criticism, of which, indeed, he once at least was made the object in a manner not

* *Memoir of Charles Reade, D. C. L., Dramatist, Novelist, Journalist.* By CHARLES READE and the Rev. COMPTON READE. New York: Harper & Bros. 1887.

creditable to the critic. We respect Reade all the more for being thus "thin-skinned." In this particular he presented a marked contrast to certain literary pachyderms of the present day, who never flinch under the most caustic applications, but continue the dull cynicism of their superficial novel-writing, unhasting, unwearying, and, we may add, unchanging.

It may seem singular, but it is none the less true, that Goethe was the first man in Europe to recognise the greatness of Carlyle, and recognise him he did, and pronounced him to be a man who rested on an original foundation, and had the capacity to develop in himself the essentials of what was good and beautiful. On the other hand, it is not too much to say that Carlyle first introduced German literature to English readers, and, as the greatest contemporary figure of German literature, Goethe himself.

It was through Madame De Staël's book on Germany that Carlyle first was interested in German thought and speculations. At this time he had thrown away the traditionary beliefs of his people, and was wandering in perplexity. He set himself to master the German language, and at length acquired the power of reading and understanding the poet of Weimar. In the writings of that great intellect he found the clue which led him through the labyrinthine maze of doubt and despair. Under the guidance of Goethe he professes to have achieved his own spiritual emancipation. Yet he never acquired that great power of balance and serenity which distinguishes his mighty master; that supreme and cheerful optimism, which to acquire is to gain happiness and peace in life's conflict. We are sometimes inclined to set down the distressed anxiety and want of repose in Carlyle's mental experience to his incomplete acquaintance with the art and thought of the ancient world. His experience broke off at the phenomena which surrounded him, while Goethe saw the whole story of civilisation and moral development from the beginning, and would smile and rest from a sense of fuller knowledge and more accurate interpretation. The letters* which passed between Goethe and Carlyle have been now before the public. Charles Eliot Norton is laboring hard to vindicate and clear the memory of a man to whom he, as well as many others, owes so great an intellectual debt. These letters are wisely published by him, for they show Carlyle at his best; while the splendor of Goethe's name will derive fresh lustre from the beauty and goodness which shine through his share in the correspondence.

* *Correspondence between Goethe and Carlyle.* Edited by CHARLES ELIOT NORTON. London and New York: Macmillan & Co.

History.

The history of *Oxford*,* by the Rev. C. W. Boase, is a valuable addition to the "Historic Towns" Series which is being ably edited by Dr. Freeman and the Rev. William Hunt. The task of compressing into the space of two hundred pages an account of one thousand years was a difficult one. But, as was to be expected of the laborious compiler of the *Register of Exeter College*, the vast quantity of matter has been so judiciously sifted that a tolerably well-connected view has been given of a history in which little organic unity or continuity of growth can be traced. The book contains seven chapters, and deals with early Oxford, the Growth of the City, the University and the City, the Renaissance and the Reformation, the Stuarts, later Oxford, and modern Oxford. There are also two maps and a good index. Oxford, at all times a place of charm, will be still more delightful to the reader of Mr. Boase's book.

The Church and the Roman Empire† is "intended to trace in outline the relations between Christianity and the Roman Empire and the external growth of the Church during the fourth and fifth centuries." In a small half-crown book Mr. Carr conveys a great deal of information, and introduces his readers to a multitude of important personages. The series — "Epochs of Church History" — to which it belongs cannot fail to do much good. The next volume in the series will be *The Church and the Puritans*, by Mr. Wakeman of All Souls College, Oxford.

Travel.

In *Moss from a Rolling Stone*‡ we have some of the rich and varied experience of a distinguished student of human life. The "stone" began to "roll" nearly fifty years ago, and has gathered moss in India, China, and Japan, as well as in Italy, Poland, and Eastern Europe. More than one adventure related is of absorbing interest. Everywhere these pages exhibit a thorough knowledge of men and a keen sense of their sins and follies. Twenty years have passed since Mr. Oliphant found that "the world, with its bloody wars, its political intrigues, its social evils, its religious cant, its financial frauds, and its glaring anomalies, assumed more and more the aspect of a gigantic lunatic asylum," and, *altiora petens*, resolved to retire from it and give himself

* *Historic Towns: Oxford*. By C. W. BOASE, Fellow of Exeter College. London: Longmans, Green & Co. New York: Baum & Geddes.

† *The Church and the Roman Empire*. By ARTHUR CARR, M. A., late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. Longmans, Green & Co. New York: Baum & Geddes.

‡ *Episodes in a Life of Adventure; or Moss from a Rolling Stone*. By I. A. W. RENCE OLIPHANT. London and Edinburgh: Blackwood & Sons. New York: Baum & Geddes.

up to the study of those mysterious laws "which govern human action." But his light could not be hid. In justice to Mr. Oliphant it must be said that he is far more genial and far less cynical than might be inferred from his words.

The North and Northwest of Ireland is indeed to most people *An Unknown Country** which deserves to be well known. It is pleasant, even in mental association, to accompany the author of *John Halifax* and her genial companions in their holiday ramble among old castles, round towers, and delightful scenery. Even Irish weather could not mar the cheeriness of good company. One of the pleasantest walks we ourselves ever took was in thick mist and pouring rain over a Welsh mountain in the company of a veteran who had fought at Inkerman. Mrs. Craik's volume abounds in picturesque sketches, shrewd remarks, and quiet humor. The illustrations are from the skilful pencil of Mr. Noel Paton.

Fiction.

Humor is a rarer type of literary power than pathos, or than dramatic action. It is rarer and it is more precious to the human race. You may count on your fingers the great works of humor in the world, and when you have mentioned *Don Quixote*, *Sir Roger de Coverly*, and *Pickwick*, you have three of the most important characters in literature. *Pickwick*, indeed, is a kind of modern Quixote in breeches and broad-brimmed hat, and, like the famous Knight of the Woful Countenance, he has been adopted by all European nationalities as their own. There are few more real contributions to what Goethe loved to contemplate as a possible *world literature* than the inimitable creation of Charles Dickens. No personage outside some of the personages of Shakespeare, Molière, and Goethe himself, is so well known to the world at large as Mr. Pickwick. When Charles Dickens, *filis*, puts forth, therefore, this Jubilee edition † of his father's immortal work, we feel that it will be eagerly welcomed by all lovers of the *Pickwick Papers*. The illustrations are many, some of them good, especially the topographical ones, all of them interesting, while many are at least curious. Curious also is the account of the controversy concerning the originality of the story between the publishers of *Pickwick* and the widow of the artist Seymour, who designed the first illustrations for the work, and who had intended to design them all. Hablot K. Browne succeeded him and became famous as a Dickens illustrator.

* *An Unknown Country*. By the author of "John Halifax." London and New York : Macmillan & Co.

† *The Posthumous Papers of the Pickwick Club*. By CHARLES DICKENS. With notes and numerous illustrations. Edited by CHARLES DICKENS, the Younger. 2 vols. London and New York : Macmillan & Co.

Here we have an amusing examination paper set by Calverly on these *Pickwick Papers*. It is exhaustive and searching, after the manner of of a university examination paper, or a Greek play. We defy even the most ardent lover of Dickens to obtain fuller works on it.

Charles Dickens has illustrated with many notes the slang and vernacular expressions, as well as the local allusions, which this Cockney comedy of life abounds in. There is also prefixed a facsimile of the original design for the green cover in which the story, part by part, was first issued.

In *Kintail Place** an anonymous author has furnished us with a cleverly-written tale, the scenes of which are chiefly laid in France and Italy during the period of the French Revolution. The horrors of the times, although accurately reproduced, are depicted, perhaps, too vividly. They supply material for many thrilling adventures on the part especially of the hero and heroine. The latter's troubles are brought on her chiefly through self-will, of which she repents after her marriage. The moral tone that pervades the story renders it a safe one to recommend for general perusal.

Mr. Rider Haggard's phenomenal success is not likely to be impeded by the numerous snarling critics who invariably dog the heels of merit. *Allan Quatermain*† may, perhaps, be correctly described as a continuation of *Solomon's Mines*. Allan in company with his friends Curtis and Good start to discover a white race said to inhabit a portion of North Central Africa, and add to their number the fearless, fight-loving Umslopogaas. Marvellously weird and exciting adventures enthral the reader. Lovely queens, horrible battle scenes, and hair-breadth escapes are depicted by Mr. Haggard with a power peculiarly his own. *Solomon's Mines* was said to be worth a whole year's harvest of ordinary novels. The author has not yet lost his skill.

Poetry.

The Banquet of Dante Alighieri, ‡ which now, excepting the three poems that serve as the text for Dante's Commentary, appears for the first time in an English dress. The work is a fragment of what was intended to be an "ethical survey of human knowledge in fifteen treatises." The poet relates how, after the loss of his first love, Beatrice, he became enamoured of "the most beautiful and most excellent daughter of the Ruler of the Universe, Philosophy, a lady full of

* *Kintail Place: a Tale of Revolution*. London: Swan, Sonnenschein & Co. New York: Baum & Geddes.

† *Allan Quatermain*. By H. RIDER HAGGARD. London: Longmans, Green & Co. New York: Baum & Geddes.

‡ *The Banquet of Dante Alighieri*. Translated by ELIZABETH PRICE SAYER. London and New York: Routledge & Sons.

sweetness, adorned with modesty, wonderful for wisdom, the glory of freedom," whose "eyes look straight into the eyes of the intellect, enamour the soul and set it free from the trammels of circumstance." Animated by the nobility of such a friendship men may learn to despise the world, triumph over self, escape the death of ignorance and vice, and so pass to love purified and refined in the world to come. The reader who is not familiar with Dante will need some initial energy as well as reverent curiosity if he is not to be stopped at the beginning by mediæval theories of the formation of the heavens, and other ancient ideas "ingenious, but in no part true." He will soon find, however, that many a spiritual impulse is to be derived from the "Banquet." The volume is the forty-ninth in the Universal Library Series, edited by Professor Henry Morley.

Educational.

In *Principles of English Etymology*,* the distinguished author, Dr. Skeats, deals with the native element, or primary source of modern English, Latin words found in Anglo-Saxon, and early words of Celtic and Scandinavian origin being included. The secondary sources, it is promised, will be dealt with in another volume. It would be presumptuous to praise or blame a scholar who is perhaps unrivalled in his department. Our purpose is rather to briefly give some idea of a book which, we venture to say, will be found invaluable to the student, and which ought to be on the shelves of every English or American gentleman. The precise subject of inquiry is the etymology of words current in modern English, that is to say, of such words as were in common use in the year 1500, — a convenient starting-point for the latest period. In the preparation of his well-known Etymological English Dictionary Dr. Skeat accumulated a vast number of details, necessarily without apparent connection; in the work before us these results are systematised, and the laws which regulate them are stated and explained. The sources of the language are enumerated, the importance of the historical method is emphasised and copiously illustrated, the three main dialects, Northern, Southern, and Midland are distinguished, and the long vowels are carefully discussed. The next step is to the cognate Teutonic languages. And here many readers will be surprised to learn that some three and twenty words at most are all in English that are directly derived from German, so erroneous is the impression that English is "derived from German." We pass next to the cognate classical languages, and find Grimm's law enunciated in a form much simpler than the common one. The chapters on

* *Principles of English Etymology.* By the Rev. W. SKEAT, Litt. D., LL. D. Edin., M. A. Oxon., Professor of Anglo-Saxon in the University of Cambridge. Oxford: Clarendon Press. New York: Macmillan & Co.

spelling are particularly interesting. It is perhaps needless to say that Dr. Skeat believes that we shall some day have to make the experiment of a phonetic system and put up with the grave inconvenience. His own account of modern spelling is not flattering. "Generally speaking," he says, "it represents a Victorian pronunciation of 'popular' words by means of symbols imperfectly adapted to an Elizabethan pronunciation; the symbols themselves being mainly due to the Anglo-French scribes of the Plantagenet period, whose system was meant to be phonetic. It also aims at suggesting to the eye the original forms of 'learned words. It is thus governed by two conflicting principles, neither of which, in its own domain, is consistently carried out." The concluding chapters are devoted to early words of Latin origin, the Celtic element, the Scandinavian element, and the effects of accent. A list of 3,000 representative words, compiled by the author himself and treated of by him, makes the work a valuable book for reference. The antecedents and eccentricities of numerous old friends among these words will afford amusement and instruction for many a half-hour. The sixth-form boy who thinks the study of English beneath him, and the university man who, judging by his application to the subject, imagines that the tongue of Chaucer and Milton needs no learning, are not yet extinct. We trust that under Dr. Skeat's guidance English will be placed where it ought to stand, both in school and university.

Sociology.

The land of the Pharaohs is just now an important factor in European politics, and we have another book about it in Mr. Butler's *Court Life in Egypt*.* Mr. Butler was tutor to the Khedive's sons, and therefore enjoyed unusual opportunities for the study of Egyptian society. The Dôrah, a revolting religious ceremony in which a sheikh used to ride over the bodies of prostrate dervishes, was happily done away in great measure by the influence of the author, who, with considerable descriptive power and in a highly entertaining style, portrays the present enlightened ruler, and pictures not only the pageantry of palaces, but also the manners and customs of the people. A firm hand and great judgment will be needed before the once prevalent anarchy and corruption will be replaced by a better state of things.

Lord Iddesleigh's Lectures and Essays. † The reader of this volume will easily apprehend the secret of the personal charm which gained for the statesman whose inner life is here revealed the ever-increasing affection of friends and the respect of opponents. Now teaching in the

* *Court Life in Egypt.* By A. J. Butler. With illustrations. London: Chapman & Hall. New York: Baum & Geddes.

† *Lectures and Essays.* By Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, first Earl of Iddesleigh. London and Edinburgh: Blackwood & Sons. New York: Baum & Geddes.

reformatory school on his own property, now lecturing before literary societies in the neighborhood of Exeter, he showed how keen an interest he took in every movement which was likely to promote the material or intellectual welfare of his countrymen. His placidity, as far as possible removed from indolence or timidity or indecision, his pleasant and genial manner, sense of humor, fondness for general literature, and taste for historical and antiquarian research, fairness towards those from whom he differed, and ready recognition of worth wherever it was found, are pleasing features in the portrait of a man whose political position was almost unparalleled.

Theology.

Social Aspects of Christianity * consists of fourteen sermons, all of which (with two exceptions) were preached at Westminster Abbey by Canon Westcott in August and December, 1886. The best thoughts of thirty years on the subject are here systematised and so presented as to be easily appropriated by a thoughtful reader. The writer maintains that the supremacy of our Divine and therefore inexhaustible religion "extends to all social organisations, to all civil compacts, to all imperial designs, no less than to all doctrine of GOD and the single soul;" and that the Incarnation, the Death of CHRIST, and the Resurrection of CHRIST, being the central facts of the Gospel, form the foundation of social morality. Taking the family, with its essential relations of marriage, fatherhood, and brotherhood, as the unit, he constructs the true idea of the Nation, the Race, and the Church, and points out how *equality, liberty, fraternity* find their real correlatives in Christian righteousness, peace, and joy. Particularly interesting are the two chapters in which the Franciscans are compared and contrasted with the Quakers. S. Francis sacrificed the individual; Fox left wholly out of account the powers of the larger life of the Church and the race. They were both signal benefactors of mankind, both illustrious examples of self-surrender; but both originated one-sided developments, and were therefore doomed to ultimate failure. The contemplation of a Christian fellowship which shall "assimilate new ideas without breaking with the past," and which shall be at once comprehensive, social, open, rational, and spiritual, a fellowship of "brethren and sisters of the common hope," stirs the heart and opens the fountains of prayer. Canon Westcott thinks the day is not far off when the ideal may be realised.

The author of *Essays and Addresses* † in his letter to a Bristol arti-

* *Social Aspects of Christianity*. By BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D. D., D. C. L., Canon of Westminster and Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. London and New York: Macmillan & Co.

† *Essays and Addresses*. An attempt to treat some religious questions in a scientific

san claims for himself no more than a knowledge of just enough mathematics to compare his ability and knowledge with those of the great mathematicians of the day, of enough literature and thought to feel that in comparison with Browning, Lightfoot, and Max Müller, he is an untrained child, enough science to appreciate the genius of men like Huxley and Helmholtz. And yet, if we mistake not, Mr. Wilson was senior wrangler. For nearly thirty years he has studied and taught science, and, as the successful head of a distinguished educational institution, has won for himself a cordial and appreciative recognition. Few men are more capable of dealing with religious subjects in a scientific spirit. The essays and addresses treat of a variety of subjects, — a drop of water regarded as supplying a chapter in natural religion, morality in public schools, the theory of inspiration, the limits of authority and free thought, etc., and were delivered before audiences so widely different as the Education Society, large gatherings of artisans, Church Congresses [1882 and 1886], and members of the University of Oxford. The reader will probably regret that Mr. Wilson does not exhibit more respect for dogmatic precision and the formulæ of a scientific theology; but he will not fail to find on every page a robust and manly Christianity which is not afraid to grapple with difficulties, combined with a breadth of view and a warmth of love which appeal to head and heart alike. The address on *Morality in Public Schools* ought to be read by every schoolmaster and by every father who cares to save his sons from years, it may be, of struggle, of moral weakness, and secret shame. As models of style for the handling of intelligent workmen (more formidable foes than is commonly supposed), we know of nothing better than some of these addresses with their conspicuous modesty, unvarying courtesy, plain speaking, and hard hitting. In lecture ten the limits of evolution are so placed as to satisfy the most orthodox person who is not utterly destitute of the scientific faculty. Everywhere Mr. Wilson illustrates his own words, "that the deepest and sincerest Christianity is compatible with a clear and powerful intellect, and with the deepest and sincerest love of truth."

The notable awakening of historical studies which we have been witnessing within the last twenty years has not been confined to the department of political history alone. New materials dealing with the time and work of Boniface, the Waldensians, Wiclif, Hus, Luther, Melancthon, Wallenstein, Gustavus Adolfus, have been discovered of late, and induced Church historians and dogmatists to go into the details of the new matter with a view of shedding new

spirit. By the Rev. J. M. WILSON, M. A., late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, Head Master of Clifton College, and Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of London. London and New York: Macmillan & Co.

light on the period, or the man they have chosen for the subject. A work of extraordinary value and singular interest for all those wishing to trace the origin and gradual formation of the doctrine of the Church has just been published. The author is Professor Dr. A. Reuter, of Goettingen University, our most eminent Church historian, whose comprehensive and profound knowledge of Church matters, deep insight into historical movements, and keen sagacity make him most competent to handle theological problems connected with history. Books on Augustine and his theological views, some of them giving merely traditional conclusions, have of late flooded the market. Reuter's present work, * which is the result of nearly ten years' labor, gives a comprehensive view of the main points of Augustine's teaching, and shows with great clearness the dogmatical development he has passed through. Of his scholarship and penetrating insight into the various problems offered by Augustine's theology, we can hardly speak in too high terms. In the preface dated Easter Sunday, 1887, Dr. Reuter says that he claims for his book, "Not the forbearance, but the fair criticism of his readers;" for historical truth, he continues, "cannot be arrived at by repeating traditional rubbish, the inconsistency of which I have undertaken to prove on the following pages, not by answering painstaking studies by rash and shallow assertions, but merely by scientific argumentation based on the whole of Augustine's writings." In his chapters, Reuter, backed in every case by numerous and well-digested quotations from Augustine, gives the outlines of the great writer's doctrine of the Church, his motives for the Pelagian controversy, the doctrine of the Church in its relation to Predestinationism, and after having made Augustine's book, *De Civitate Dei*, the subject of an admirable study, he describes his author's ideas of the Church as the Kingdom of God, goes on to show the Episcopate in its relation to the Church and to the Roman See, his doctrine on Tradition, Councils, Papal Infallibility, characterises in outline the Secular and Religious Life (Monasticism) and Science (Mysticism) of the time, and concludes with giving an excellent and characteristic sketch of Augustine as a thinker, a theologian, and a writer, as well as of his influence on the history and the doctrine of the Church. We would recommend this important work which, while declining to base its conclusions on antiquated views, has laid the whole range of Augustine's works under contribution, and is executed in a truly scientific and historical manner.

* *Augustinische Studien*, A. REUTER. Gotha: Perthes. 1887. New York: Baum & Geddes.

BULLETIN OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,

NOVEMBER, 1887,

FOR SALE BY

BAUM AND GEDDES,

28 West Twenty-Third Street, New York.

BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY.

Matthew Calbraith Perry: A Typical American Naval Officer. By WM. ELLIOT GRIFFIS, D. D., author of "The Mikado's Empire," etc. Illustrated. Crown 8vo, gilt top, \$2.00.

The Life of Abraham Lincoln. By J. G. HOLLAND. Large octavo, with two Portraits, \$2.00. This book, published exclusively by subscription just after the war, is now reissued after lying dormant for twenty years. During this period Dr. Holland's other writings have steadily increased in circulation and popularity, but to many readers and lovers of his books the "Life of Lincoln" is still unknown. This is, and always will be, The People's Life of Lincoln, popular and trustworthy.

Reginald Pole, Cardinal Archbishop of Canterbury. An historical sketch. By FREDERICK GEORGE LEE, D. D., with etched portrait of Pole. Limited letterpress edition. Octavo, cloth, extra, \$2.50.

A curious biographical and historical study, which throws light on various vexed questions of the reign of Queen Mary.

Historic Girls. Stories of Girls who have Influenced the History of Their Times. By E. S. BROOKS. Octavo, fully illustrated. Uniform with "Historic Boys," and "Chivalric Days," by the same author. \$2.00.

CONTENTS: Elizabeth of Tudor, the Girl of the Hertford Manor; Zenobia of Palmyra; Clotilda of Burgundy, the Girl of the French Vineyards; Pulcheria of Constantinople, the Girl of the Golden Horn; Woo of Hwang-Ho, the Girl of the Yellow River; Edith of Scotland, the Girl of the Norman Abbey; Jacqueline of Holland, the Girl of the Land of Fogs; Catarina of Venice, the Girl of the Grand Canal; Helena of Britain, the Girl of the Essex Fens; Theresa of Avila, the Girl of the Sierras; Christina of Sweden the Girl of the Fiords; Mataoka of Powhatan, the Girl of Virginia.

Recollections of a Minister to France, 1869-1877. By the Hon. E. B. WASHBURN. 2 vols., fully illustrated, cloth, 8vo, \$8.00.

The period covered in these volumes, a foretaste of which was given in the papers published in *Scribner's Magazine*, is one of the most interesting in modern French history; and the fact that Minister Washburne, while in Paris during the siege, was in a position not only to see all that was taking place, but also to know and to come in contact with the forces that were at work behind the scenes, gives an unusual value to his observations and to his comments on passing events. The illustrations are drawn with great spirit, and add to the vividness of the author's descriptions.

Abbeys and Churches of England and Wales. Descriptive, Historical, Pictorial. Edited by the Rev. T. G. BONNEY, Sc. Doc., F. R. S., Professor of Geology in University College, London. \$5.00.

Institutes of Christian History. By the Rt. Rev. A. CLEVELAND COXE, D. D., Bishop of Western New York. Large 12mo, \$1.50.

This volume contains the First Annual Course of Lectures on the Baldwin foundation, delivered before the Hobart Guild of the University of Michigan, in October, November, and December, 1886.

The "Institutes" are an outline of Christian History, based on the original idea of discarding a conventional treatment of the subject, and reducing words and theories to the hard foundation of demonstrated facts. The author adjusts the Science of History to the admitted facts of history, and thus far follows the scientists of the age, discarding empirical and exploded formulas and phrases. By endeavoring to present the student with a system conformed to Anti-Nicene Constitutions, and to admitted but as yet not duly recognized truths, he aims to remove ambiguities and to make the learner a master of what he studies.

The Ancient Cities of the New World: Being Voyages and Explorations in Mexico and Central America, from 1857 to 1882. By DÉsirÉ CHAR-NAY. Translated from the French by J. GONINO and HELEN S. CONANT. Introduction by ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE. 209 Illustrations and a Map. Pp. xlvii., 514. Royal 8vo, ornamental cloth, uncut edges, gilt top, \$6.00.
"A most important contribution to the literature of American antiquities."

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

The Christian Year. By the Rev. JOHN KEBLE, M. A. The St. Paul's Edition. With the Collects and a Series of Meditations and Exhortations selected from the works of the Rev. H. P. Liddon, D. D., Canon Residentiary of St. Paul's, etc. 8vo, 453 pages, \$2.50.

A better gift-book of the religious kind it would not be easy to find. — *Pall Mall Gazette* (London).

Those who do not possess Dr. Liddon's works will gain an excellent idea of him as a preacher from this book. The "extracts" are really passages from his sermons, some of them occupying as much as two pages of this work. — *Literary Churchman* (London).

History of the Christian Philosophy of Religion. By Professor PUN-JER, translated by W. HASTIE, B. D., and with an Introduction by Professor ROBERT FLINT. 2 vols. large 8vo, net, \$10.50.

System of Christian Ethics. By Dr. I. A. DORNER, Professor of Theology, Berlin. Edited by Dr. A. DORNER, translated by Prof. C. M. MEAD, D. D., formerly Professor of Hebrew in Andover Theological Seminary, and Rev. R. T. CUNNINGHAM. 8vo, cloth, \$3.50.

The Hibbert Lectures, 1887. Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as illustrated by the Religion of the Ancient Babylonians. By A. H. SAYCE. Thick 8vo, cloth, \$3.75.

Faint, Yet Pursuing, and Other Sermons. By EDWARD J. HARDY, M. A., Chaplain to H. M. Forces, author of "How to be Happy though Married." Crown 8vo, cloth, \$1.75.

FICTION.

The Earth Trembled. By EDWARD P. ROE. 12mo, \$1.50.

It reaches the common feelings and sympathies of readers with all the power that has made the other novels so wonderfully popular. — *Boston Globe*.

An American Penman. From the Diary of Inspector Byrnes. By JULIAN HAWTHORNE. Paper, 50 cents; extra cloth, \$1.00.

A Tragic Mystery. From the Diary of Inspector Byrnes. By JULIAN HAWTHORNE. Paper, 50 cents; extra cloth, \$1.00.

The Great Bank Robbery. From the Diary of Inspector Byrnes. By JULIAN HAWTHORNE. Paper, 50 cents; extra cloth, \$1.00.

On the news-stands, in the hotel corridors, on the railway trains, the works of Byrnes-Hawthorne vie with those of Stevenson and Rider Haggard in popularity, and possess the unusual merit of truth. Inspector Byrnes was not obliged to go to Africa, nor to call upon his imagination for suggestions for a story, but turned to memory and his note-books, and has given, and is to give evidence that truth is indeed stranger than fiction. — *The Evening Sun* (New York).

Dog Stories and Dog Lore. Experiences of two boys in rearing and training dogs, with many anecdotes of canine intelligence. An elegant, illustrated, and exhaustive work on the Dog, by Col. THOMAS W. KNOX, author of "The Boy Travellers," "The Young Nimrods," "Marco Polo," etc., etc. 1 vol., 4to, elegant double chromo cover, done in 12 colors, \$1.75; extra cloth, gold and colored inks, \$2.50.

Judge Tourgee's New Story. Button's Inn. By ALBION W. TOURGEE, author of "A Fool's Errand," "Hot Plowshares," etc. One handsome 12mo volume, bound in cloth, 428 pages, \$1.25.

New Edition, in French, of Victor Hugo's Les Misérables. 5 volumes, paper covers, \$4.50; cloth, \$6.50; half calf, \$13.50.

This is a new and superb edition printed from new type on handsome paper made expressly for it, and is very tastefully bound. It is not only the best and most convenient edition, but is much cheaper than the only Paris edition now published.

A fine holiday gift for readers of French.

GENERAL LITERATURE.

English Writers. An attempt towards a History of English Literature. By HENRY MORLEY, LL. D., Professor of English Literature at University College, London. Vol. II. Extra cloth, gilt top, \$1.50.

Other volumes to follow.

Bo-Peep. "The Juvenile Book of the Year." An elegant quarto volume, full of illustrations, with delightful stories, in large, clear type. Elegant lithographic cover, \$1.00; extra cloth, new and elegant dies in gold and several colors of ink (new style), \$1.50.

The Standard Cantatas. Their Stories, their Music and their Composers.

Bulletin of New Publications.

A Handbook. By GEORGE P. UPTON. Uniform with "The Standard Operas" and "The Standard Oratorios." 12mo, yellow edges, \$1.50; full gilt, \$2.00.

The "Standard Cantatas" forms the third volume in the uniform series which already includes the "Standard Operas" and the "Standard Oratorios." This latest work deals with a class of musical compositions, midway between the opera and the oratorio, which is growing rapidly in favor both with composers and audiences. As in the two former works the subject is treated, so far as possible, in an untechnical manner, so that it may satisfy the needs of musically uneducated concert-goers, and add to their enjoyment by a plain statement of the story of the cantatas and a popular analysis of its music, with pertinent selections from its poetical text. The book includes a comprehensive essay on the origin of the cantata, and its development from rude beginnings; biographical sketches of the composers; carefully prepared descriptions of the plots and music; and an appendix containing the names and dates of composition of all the best known cantatas from the earliest times.

The Modern School of Art. Edited by WILFRED MEYNELL. With 8 full-page plates and etchings, and over 125 illustrations, cloth, \$6.00.

Pen Portraits of Literary Women. By HELEN GRAY CONE and JEANNETTE L. GILDER. 2 vols., 12mo, gilt top, per set, \$3.00.

A Photographic Facsimile of the Famous First Folio Edition (A. D. 1623) of Shakespeare's Plays. The only way to test the Donnelly cipher. The 1623 Edition is the sole authority for the texts of many of the Shakespeare plays. A rare book, unsurpassed in interest and critical value. A literary treasure. Crown 8vo, cloth, \$2.50.

Court Life in Egypt. By A. J. BUTLER, author of "The Ancient Coptic Churches of Egypt." Demy 8vo, with illustrations, cloth, \$4.50.

The Printed Book: Its History, Illustration, and Adornment. From the Days of Gutenberg to the Present Time. By HENRI BOUCHOT, of the National Library, Paris. Translated and enlarged by EDWARD C. BIGMORE. With 118 Illustrations of fac-similes of Early Typography, Printers Marks, Copies of Book Illustrations, and Specimens of Bindings of all ages. Square 8vo, 320 pages, gilt top, \$2.50.

Any of these books will be sent free on receipt of price.

FINE STATIONERY.

We are now prepared to fill orders by mail for anything in the Stationery line, and samples will be sent on application. We invite the attention of the clergy to our Sermon paper of different sizes. Send for sample and price.

BAUM AND GEDDES,

28 West Twenty-Third Street, New York.